

Gardner-Webb Review

VOLUME IV



2002

BOILING SPRINGS, NORTH CAROLINA

Gardner-Webb Review

EDITOR

Jackson Rainer, Ph.D.

EDITORIAL BOARD

Kim Hartman, Ph.D.
David Parker, Ph.D.
Valerie Parry, M.S.L.S.

Kevin Plonk, Ph.D.

Frank Bonner, Ph.D.
Tamara Cox, Ph.D.
Lorin Cranford, Ph.D.

EDITORIAL ASSOCIATES

Joanne Snyder
Kelly Harrison

FACULTY MENTORS

Kent Blevins, Ph.D.
Joyce Brown, Ph.D.
David Carscaddon, Ph.D.

Vic Costello, Ph.D.
Lorin Cranford, Ph.D.
June Hobbs, Ph.D.

Graphic Design by Kathy Martin

The Gardner-Webb Review is an annual, refereed publication associated with the Year of the Scholar Project at Gardner-Webb University. The review presents work of outstanding scholarship in all academic disciplines represented in the undergraduate curriculum of the university. The Gardner-Webb Review strives to foster interactions in philosophy, practice, theory, and research, as well as present topical and contemporary issues to stimulate other theorists and scholars. The journal hopes to include the widest scope of orientations to inform our readers.

Manuscripts adhere to the humanities or author-date style described in Chapters Fifteen and Sixteen of the Chicago Manual of Style, Fourteenth Edition. Authors of published essays have been under the mentorship of a faculty member within their specified discipline, with essays reviewed and approved by an Editorial Committee appointed by the steering committee of the Year of the Scholar project.

Manuscripts should be prepared and submitted to the editor according to these guidelines. All materials contained in this publication are the property of Gardner-Webb University. Articles may be reproduced or excerpted with written permission of the Editor. Correspondence regarding submissions and other inquiries should be directed to: Jackson Rainer, Ph.D., Editor, Gardner-Webb Review, Box 7251, Gardner-Webb University, Boiling Springs, NC 28017 (phone 704-406-3965). Email address: jrainer@gardner-webb.edu

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Bible in Ten Days: Detecting Ellery Queen's Religious Themes SUMMER P. JEFFCOAT	3
A Study of Glossolalia from a New Testament Perspective JACOB D. MYERS	19
Jesus' Baptismal Motivation MICHAEL STONE	67
Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder ELISHA OLIVER	117
The Evolution of the English Second Person Singular Personal Pronoun via the Mechanisms of Natural Selection as Seen Through the Lord's Prayer ARY BOTTOMS	131
Tortuous Acts in the Home: It's a War Zone Behind Closed Doors KATHERINE BURCH	155

Dover Memorial Library
Gardner-Webb University
P.O. Box 836
Boiling Springs, N.C. 28017

LD

1891

.G27

R48

2002

v.4

c.2

THE BIBLE IN *TEN DAYS*:

DETECTING ELLERY QUEEN'S

RELIGIOUS THEMES

SUMMER P. JEFFCOAT

He was a detective in search of the truth. He was an author who penned scores of stories presenting Americans with logical solutions for their mysteries. He proved the depth of a genre, and some of his themes share amazing parallels to the Bible. "He *is* the American detective story," according to detective critic Anthony Boucher (11). Yet he existed only as a figment of his audience's imagination. Two Jewish cousins from New York created him; his name is Ellery Queen—the name of the author who was Edgar Allen Poe's literary descendant and the name of the detective whom the *London Times* called "the logical successor to Sherlock Holmes" (Queen *Adventures*, preliminary quotes).

Ellery Queen's forefathers built the foundation upon which Queen would craft the traditional American detective story. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle mastered the English detective fiction form with his character Sherlock Holmes, the character that has become synonymous with the term detective. Poet and critic Edgar Allen Poe began the detective genre in America with six works of detective fiction. He called these stories "tales of ratiocination" because of the necessity of the detective's rationale in solving the puzzles. Poe's fictional detective Auguste C. Dupin appeared in the early 1840s using his keen logic and observation to gather clues (Daniel 103-105). Today, Poe is given literary credit, intellectual respect, and the title "father of the modern detective story." This credit is almost ironic considering that Poe's work was popular literature during his time. Other works of popular literature, such as the stories by Ellery Queen, though extremely important to the detective fiction genre, seem to be overlooked or forgotten.

Scholars often criticize detective story authors for following a formula, yet Edgar Allen Poe, the author who invented the formula, is considered a genius. Poe's formula for his tales of ratiocination included "a seemingly insoluble mystery, a supremely brilliant yet eccentric detective, an observant though less astute confidant, and an earnest yet inept police investigator" (Kennedy 750-751). "The centenary of Poe's death in 1849 evoked new

tributes to the keenness of his intelligence, in proof of which his detective stories were freely cited" (Daniel 103). Although Poe fathered the detective story, "In a sense there was no future for detection as Poe wrote it, for as Poe wrote it, it isn't literature," according to Erik Routley in *The Puritan Pleasures of the Detective Story* (188). Larry Landrum, a scholar who compiled a reference guide for detective fiction, calls Poe the "predecessor" of the detective story (4), and Routley calls Poe's invention of the detective story in the 1840's "a false start." Like any invention, Poe's detective story had to be improved upon by others. The traditional detective story form did not take shape in the true American style until the twentieth century (188) during The Golden Age of detective fiction between 1925 and 1945.

Scholars remember those years as a golden age of literature as well—the "modernist" period in which authors such as T.S. Eliot, Ernest Hemingway, and William Butler Yeats wrote with "a strong commitment to breaking away from both patterned responses and predictable forms" (Lauter 951). Yet during the modernist period, "real people" were reading detective stories—patterned works written in a way that enabled readers to predict the outcome. Betty Rosenberg, author of *Genreflecting*, points out that classics are "revered though seldom read" while "the patterned story still has the appeal—whatever magic is inherent in the genre—that keeps the fan enchanted" (18). Popular literature captivates readers much like religion because it is a part of popular culture, according to John Wiley Nelson, author of *Your God is Alive and Well and Appearing in Popular Culture*. Nelson points out that popular culture, similar to religion, reinforces beliefs that are already held, while art presents new beliefs and challenges the reader to think differently. Popular literature reflects society's belief systems and shapes those beliefs as well, indicating America's beliefs more than high literature and art could (196).

Detective fiction is one type of popular literature that reflects the belief systems and fears of humanity and society, yet has been undermined by scholars like modernist Edmund Wilson who once said, "The reading of detective novels is a kind of vice...addictive, wasteful of time and degrading to the intellect" (qtd. in Rosenberg 16). Nelson says that while demeaning the value of popular literature may satisfy one's ego, it will cause one to neglect key truths about humanity and society (196).

Detective fiction possesses many religious themes that illustrate what Robert F. Geary, in his essay *On Horror and Religion*, calls humanity's intrinsic "desire for the sacred" (Geary 297). During the post World War I twentieth century, authors of high literature commented on society's fragmentation and loss of faith. T.S. Eliot's poem "The Wasteland" illustrates how society fulfills the desire for the sacred by turning towards fortune-tellers, tarot cards, and other perversions of religious faith. Geary notices the same trend in today's society: "Self-help books promising psychic transformation, tracts extolling the marvels of holistic health,

astrological forecasts in the daily papers—all these and countless other examples testify to the confusing and eclectic effort for millions to attain some shaky contact with an ultimate reality which will give them some measure of control over their destiny” (297). Detective fiction presents people with a controlled destiny, a mystery that seems hopelessly unsolvable and confusing, yet has a realistic and concrete outcome.

Many well-known detective fiction authors, including G.K. Chesterton, Erle Stanley Gardner, Agatha Christie, and John Dickson Carr, contributed their stories and their solutions to society during the Golden Age of detective fiction (Ross 2). American author Ellery Queen deserves credit for his innovative melding of the puzzle form and the hard-boiled style of detective fiction. The puzzle form dates back to Poe's tales of ratiocination in which a detective analyzes a crime and a small number of suspects, and the author gives readers a fair chance to solve the mystery through numerous clues. The hard-boiled style presents society as immoral and unjust, as can be seen in the works of Raymond Chandler and Mickey Spillane. Ellery Queen, according to Karnick, presented “a perfect fusion of the puzzle mystery with the rising realism and toughness of the hard-boiled story” (Karnick 60). For his accomplishments, Ellery Queen has been called the “single most important figure of the Golden Age of the American mystery” (Karnick 59).

Ellery Queen's perspective on the detective story was strongly inspired by Poe's formula, and Queen himself defined the detective story as “a tale of ratiocination, complete with crime and/or mystery, suspects, investigation, clues, deduction, and solution; in its purest form, the chief character should be a detective, amateur or professional, who devotes most of his (or her) time to the problems of detection” (*Bibliography*, Explanatory Notes). There is no question that Poe was the *father* of the American detective story, but as stated by detective fiction critic Anthony Boucher, “Ellery Queen is the American detective story” (11).

In actuality, Ellery Queen was not a single figure, but a double personality; Queen was the pseudonym of Manfred B. Lee and Frederic Dannay as well as the name of the central detective character in their works. Lee and Dannay, cousins, grew up in Brooklyn together in the early 1900s (Haycraft 1139). Even as children, the cousins buried themselves in detective fiction, particularly Sherlock Holmes' novels. Dannay remembers the excitement of seeing a new Holmes' book in a store window, according to his novel based on the story of his youth. In *The Golden Summer*, written under Dannay's given name, Daniel Nathan, ten-year-old Danny says, “I'd rather read a Sherlock Holmes book than – than – anything!” (56) Danny's passion swayed the store's owner to let him borrow the book for the night, and the boy stayed up reading *The Valley of Fear* long past his bedtime. The last page fascinated Danny, and he meditated on the words of Sherlock Holmes: “I don't say that he can't be beat...But you must give me

time—you must give me time!’ Somehow they sounded like fateful words, and Danny had the frightening thought, deep inside of him, that the words were meant for him, only for him. He sat there in bed, and as if he were foretelling his own future...he echoed Sherlock Holmes’ words: ‘You must give me time—you must give me time!’ (57-58).

In time, 1928 to be exact, Dannay and his cousin Lee began their detective writing career by entering a *McClure’s* Magazine writing contest. Their story, *The Roman Hat Mystery* featuring detective Ellery Queen, was chosen as the winner, but the magazine went bankrupt and the cousins never received their promised \$7500 prize. However, a publisher liked their work and encouraged them to write more Ellery Queen detective novels (Nevins 1).

In their long career, the cousins penned over forty novels and nine short story collections. Francis M. Nevins, Jr., author of the only full-length book about Ellery Queen entitled *Royal Bloodline: Ellery Queen Author and Detective*, divides Queen’s career into four periods. Beginning with *The Roman Hat Mystery* in 1929 and ending with *The Spanish Cape Mystery* in 1935, all the titles of Queen’s first period works include a nationality and an object. During this period, the detective Ellery Queen possesses little emotion and human warmth, and the books are “relentlessly intellectual exercises, technically excellent but unwarmed by any trace of human character nor by any emotion other than the ‘passions of the mind’” (6-7). During Queen’s second period, the cousins focused on writing for women’s slick magazines and Hollywood scripts. Because of these mediums and the extreme volume of work produced between 1936-1942, the second period stories lack intellectual depth and overflow with “feminine emotion” and uninteresting characters that the cousins hoped actors would enliven on the silver screen. Nevins sees the second period as “a series of steps in the progressive humanization of Ellery and the Queenian universe and as the necessary preparation for the great synthesis of Period Three” (7). Period Three began in 1942, and many uphold it as “the crown of [Queen’s] career” for its superb plots, characterization, experimentation, and excursions into politics, religion, history, and psychology (8). Then in 1963, with *The Player on the Other Side*, Queen began his Fourth Period in which he repeated earlier themes while stretching the bounds of the detective story. His “radical” experiments from 1963-1971 made no attempt to be plausible (12). During this period, Lee struggled with a bout of illness and writer’s block, and ghostwriters took his place as Dannay’s writing partner. The Queen legacy ended with Lee’s death in 1971.

Although Queen was not a religious writer per se, Routley says, “It is impossible not to be fascinated by [Queen’s] occasional excursions into the religious field—and this...is very characteristically American...”(191). Because Ellery Queen played such a significant role during the Golden Age of detective fiction, Queen is an ideal author to study as an example of the

way religious themes pervaded the American detective genre. Just as Ellery Queen never claimed to be a Christian or religious writer, detective fiction itself does not purport to be a religious genre, but many critics have commented on the relationship between detective fiction and religion, noting that religious elements in the genre present deeper messages to the reader (Karnick 60). R. W. Hays, in his article "Religion and The Detective Story," mentions many detective authors who have implemented religious characters, settings, and themes in their works. The article comments on Gilbert K. Chesterton's popular Father Brown series, Harry Kemelman's stories about fictional Rabbi David Small, and various works by authors such as Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, Agatha Christie, John Dickson Carr, and Ellery Queen. Religion abounds in detective fiction, says Hays, because both Christian doctrine and good detective stories solve mysteries; Christianity solves mysteries of real life and the detective story of fiction (24-25). Jon L. Breen says, based on his survey of religious detective authors, that works of detective fiction "draw on the world of religion" because "detective fiction is intrinsically the most moral kind of fiction" (v). In the essay "The Mystery as Novel of Manners," Linda Bridges says, "The true mystery novel is intended to put into the reader's mind considerations of good and evil, human weakness and temptation and the fallenness of man" (1).

What critics have not formerly noticed is the close parallels between the common themes of detective fiction and the themes of the Bible itself—the conflict between the known and hidden, between good and evil, between reason and faith, and between salvation and death. Those polar opposites wage war against each other throughout the pages of detective fiction and the King James Version of the Bible.

Ellery Queen excels at implementing religious themes in many of his works. The novella *The Lamp of God*, has a "religious dimension," according to Nevins, that is seen again in later works such as *The King is Dead*, *The Origin of Evil*, *Ten Days' Wonder*, and *The Player on the Other Side* (Royal 461). And in the article "Religious Cults and The Mystery," Marvin Lachman mentions Queen's *The Egyptian Cross Mystery* and summarizes *And on the Eighth Day*, calling it "a mystery that can be read as a novel of religious metaphor" (101).

This study of Queen's religious themes will focus on *Ten Days' Wonder* for several reasons. First, in order to gain a true sense of Queen as an author it is necessary to examine a work that both cousins participated in writing. Ghostwriters took Lee's place writing several of Queen's other religious works, including *And On The Eighth Day* and *The Player on the Other Side*, but Manfred B. Lee and Frederic Dannay both worked on *Ten Days' Wonder*. Second, Queen wrote *Ten Days' Wonder* in 1948, during his third period, which stands today as "the crown of his career" (Nevins 8). *Ten Days' Wonder* possesses both literary and religious depth. Anthony J.

Mazzella calls the book "a parable of intellectual hubris" that gives readers "a glimpse of what all the [Queen] excitement was about," and Nevins calls it "a dazzling rich work embracing dimensions that seemed utterly incompatible with the [detective fiction] genre until Queen showed that it could be done" (*Royal* 138). The religious dimension in *Ten Days' Wonder* provides a complicated and intriguing study. Hays avoided mentioning the book with his other comments on Queen in "Religion and Detection," stating in his notes, "Other instances of Queen's use of religious subjects, as in *Ten Days' Wonder*...are difficult to classify and so are not discussed here" (26). Hays could not include *Ten Days' Wonder* in his broad article because the novel deserves a full commentary of its own.

Ten Days' Wonder stars Howard Van Horn, a young sculptor who approaches Detective Ellery Queen with a case of mysterious amnesia which began on the night Howard's foster father Diedrich married a much younger woman named Sally. When Ellery comes home with Howard to Wrightsville, Howard and his father's wife tell Ellery about their secret love affair. They solicit Ellery to help them deliver \$25,000 to an unknown blackmailer who had found love letters in Sally's stolen jewelry box. During his investigation, Ellery reasons that Howard is subconsciously unwilling to share his beloved foster father and is having an affair with Sally to punish Diedrich for getting married. When Sally is murdered, Ellery accuses Howard of committing the crime during one of his amnesiac states, and the detective uses his powerful logic to prove that Howard has broken each of the Ten Commandments in an effort to punish his father and to destroy "the greatest Father-Image of all" (*Ten* 184). Distressed and overcome with guilt, Howard kills himself. A year later, Ellery discovers that his brilliant logic had mistaken and that he had abetted the scheme of the real killer—Diedrich Van Horn. Diedrich had discovered the love letters, blackmailed the couple, murdered Sally, and plotted the entire series of crimes based on the Ten Commandments to manipulate Ellery and to frame Howard. Ellery revisits Wrightsville to confront Diedrich and forces the man to commit suicide.

Queen packs *Ten Days' Wonder* with religious overtones, and it would be impossible to thoroughly examine all of the book's religious depths here. Examples include the father-son relationship and what Detective Queen calls "the concept of the paternalism of God" (*Ten* 184); the character of Diedrich's father who was "a fundamentalist fanatic who preached the anthropomorphic, personally vengeful, jealous God of the Old Testament" (*Ten* 244); Howard's sculptures of ancient gods and their representation of both the father-image and idolatry; the Scriptures chanted by Diedrich's senile mother, including passages from Psalms, Job, and Isaiah (*Ten* 54, 102, 116-118); and Diedrich's recurring use of the number ten to plant subtle clues in Ellery's mind (233). The excursion into the religious symbolism of *Ten Days' Wonder* that follows highlights the religious

elements in the work that directly relate to the four fundamental conflicts paralleled in detective fiction and the Bible—the battle of hidden versus known, evil versus good, reason versus faith, and salvation versus death.

"In the beginning it was without form, a darkness that kept shifting like dancers" (*Ten* 3). It sounds remarkably like the first verse of the Bible where "In the beginning, the earth was without form and void" (Gen. 1.1), yet it is actually the opening remark of Ellery Queen's *Ten Days' Wonder*. Like the world itself, all detective stories begin in darkness, with the detective and the reader coming upon a mystery with very few known facts. The clues are hidden, the suspects are hidden, and the solution is hidden. As the pages turn, more and more information is made known until the detective's final revelation of the solution. "The detective story is primarily a puzzle" (Landrum 41). What is a puzzle but tiny segments of an unknown image that must be tediously pieced together to reveal that image?

The image of the unknown and the hidden provides intensity to detective fiction by stimulating what H.P. Lovecraft in his *Supernatural Horror in Literature* calls the "oldest and strongest kind of fear," the "fear of the unknown" (qtd in Geary 291). One could propose that the theme of the known versus the unknown appears in Queen's works because of the unknown fears of the post World War I twentieth century and its subsequent unrest, yet Lovecraft argues that the fear of the unknown is a timeless and innate human trait that religious themes in literature will always address (qtd. in Geary 290-291). The Bible itself addresses the fear of the unknown. Centuries before detective fiction, God's chosen people, the Israelites, feared God because He was a Great Unknown. Man could not then and cannot now see God, because His face is hidden from human view. In the Old Testament, a prophet says to God, "Verily thou art a God that hidest thyself, O God of Israel, the Saviour" (Is. 45.15). Ellery Queen agrees. In *The Lamp of God*, Queen says that "the riddle of God" is "esoteric" and "a vast blackness" (qtd. in Nevins 65-66), implying that the mystery of God is impossible to fully solve.

The mystery of God's name is also complicated, according to Ellery Queen in his solution to the Van Horn murder: "The greatest mystery of the Old Testament is the name of the Lord, which He Himself revealed to Moses; and that name is hidden in the tetragrammaton...the four consonants which were variously written—actually in five ways, from IHVH to YHWH... and of these reconstructions the most commonly accepted in the modern world is *Yahweh*" (181) Queen used his understanding of the "tetragrammaton" to charge Howard with murder: "By signing his sculpture *H. H. Waye*, Howard broke the Commandment: *Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain*...And if you'll take the letters which form the name *H. H. Waye*, you'll find that they constitute an anagram for *Yahweh*" (181).

Just as "each letter, word, number, and accent of Scripture contains a

hidden sense" (181), each chapter of *Ten Day's Wonder* contains an obvious element of the hidden or the unknown. Howard struggles with not knowing the cause or the effect of his amnesia, of "knowing he was not Diedrich's child, and not knowing whose child he was" (61). Sally and Howard hide their love affair from Diedrich, and Sally hides incriminating letters in the false bottom of a jewelry box (71). "Diedrich must never know," Sally emphasizes (70), and Ellery finds himself in the middle of the couple's scandal, feeling that "Diedrich mustn't know he knew" (82). Diedrich all the while senses that one of his family members is in trouble, and says, "Once I know, it will be easier to find out what the trouble is" (82). Ellery thinks, "With this man only doubt and uncertainty are defeating. [Diedrich] can face anything if he knows. But he must know" (168).

The unknown theme appears in the hypocrisy or multiple personalities of Queen's characters. They appear to have a certain character, to be from a certain family, to have a certain name, while their true identity remains hidden until the detective reveals it. The Bible states that a man's "outward appearance" can deceive others, but only "the Lord looketh on the heart" (I Sam. 16.7). Sometimes, the characters in Queen's works do not even know their own identity. Diedrich's son Howard experiences amnesiac states that last from minutes to weeks. When he wakes from these blackouts, he finds himself in odd locations, sometimes with blood on his clothing. He fears that he is committing crimes in his amnesiac double life, so he begs Ellery Queen to help him solve his mystery: "It's not being sure that's getting me down, Ellery. Not knowing. I've got to know! That's why I wish you'd come home with me" (*Ten* 20).

After agreeing to come home with Howard, Ellery meets Howard's father, Diedrich Van Horn, another character whose true moral fiber remains hidden behind his outward appearance. "Ellery...gathered the impression that the elder Van Horn was a great iron-chested figure, hero-sized, a man of force, dignity, humanity, brilliance, compassion, and generosity..." (*Ten* 11) However, the book's surprise ending reveals Diedrich as "the one who blackmailed Howard and Sally" (223) and the one who committed "double murder to satisfy [his] cold fury for revenge" (232).

Not only does Queen rely on the theme of the known versus the hidden in his works, the cousins, both formerly advertising executives, played on the public's fascination with the unknown to publicize the Queen works through several publicity stunts. What is now the most well known stunt existed in the beginning of the Queen legacy as a fascinating unknown—the name and personality of Ellery Queen. In the beginning stages of their work, one of the cousins would appear in public for interviews, book signings, and parties wearing a mask to hide the true identity of Ellery Queen. This stunt served to fan the flame of popularity and made the author easier to remember since the fictitious detective star of the novels shared the author's name (Haycraft 1139).

The battle of the known versus the hidden overlaps with the battle of good versus evil because most of the time, the good is known while the evil tendencies or actions of a character remain hidden until the climax of the story. The Bible echoes the idea that evildoers remain hidden in darkness: "For everyone practicing evil hates the light and does not come to the light, lest his deeds should be exposed" (John 3.20). Good is represented as light and evil takes the shape of darkness. Nevins terms this theme "theomachy, the battle....of light against darkness" and says that it is "central to several of [Queen's] later masterpieces, including *Ten Days' Wonder*, *The Player on the Other Side*, and *And On the Eighth Day*" (Royal, 65-66). The detective's intuition is a form of light used to expose the darkness. Ellery says that solving the mystery "was like trying to take a bite out of the darkness itself" (*Ten* 52). He also says, "You develop a special sense when you've poked around the darker holes of what's laughingly called the human soul as long as I have." He tells Diedrich that "a flash came" that helped him put together the puzzle pieces. "'The lightning image is a cliché,' murmured Ellery, 'but there's no substitute for it as an adequate expression of how it happened. It just struck me. 'The bolt from the blue.' By its light I made out the pattern,'" (*Ten* 167-168). Earlier in the book, while noticing Diedrich's unwavering strength and "force," Ellery almost prophetically states that Diedrich "would die only through some other force, like lightning" (38).

The forces of light triumph over darkness in both detective fiction and Scripture to expose evil. The Bible promises that "the Lord...will bring to light the hidden things of darkness" (I Cor. 4.5) and warns the evildoer, "Be sure your sin will find you out" (Num. 32.23). The detective story resembles "the moral tale, in which good is rewarded and evil punished" (Hays 24), and the Old Testament reads like a collection of short stories where good triumphs over evil—a virtuous young David defeats evil giant Goliath, a great flood cleanses the world of evil and spares only one righteous man's family, God's chosen righteous people escape the bondage of an evil Pharaoh. In Scripture, good does not defeat evil permanently until the prophesied Battle of Armageddon, and Nelson maintains that in a detective story, the conquering of evil offers only a bittersweet victory for the forces of good rather than a complete defeat of evil. It is simply "a temporary reaffirmation of the presence and power of good" (Nelson 167). Yet humans relish this victory no matter how temporary, and they find comfort in seeing evil in a tangible form. "Shapeless dreads are given shapes, however horrid. And that can be an improvement" (Geary 298).

Queen gives shape to both evil and God in his work, and even combines evil and good into one shape of an evil male character with God-like tendencies. Nevins calls this character a "puppet-master god" (Royal 136). In *Ten Days' Wonder*, Diedrich Van Horn takes this shape. Sally describes him as "a big strong protecting angel of a very masculine type. Would it

sound awfully silly if I said, 'like a god'?...You've got to realize, really understand, that Diedrich created me. Whatever I am, he shaped with his hands" (65). When Ellery accuses Diedrich in the book's finale, Diedrich responds, "You're making me out some sort of god. God Himself! I created this, I created that—I was 'sure' Howard would do this, I 'knew' Howard would do that...Aren't you giving me far too much credit, Mr. Queen, for...what would you call it? ...Omniscience?" (226).

Ten Days' Wonder is not the only book in which Queen creates this evil god-man. *The Player On The Other Side* stars a handyman of lesser intelligence named Walt whose other personality believes that he is God, and commands Walt's handyman personality to do righteous killing. In *The Origin of Evil*, Queen refers to characters as the "god of events" the "invisible god," and the "god of the machine." All of these character gods orchestrate crimes and seem to be omniscient as they formulate their evil plots. Why does Queen repeatedly create an evil character who hides his wickedness under a godly façade? The answer to that question lies not necessarily in the evil god-man's character alone, but in that character's tragic demise. By creating an evil god-man, Queen demonstrates humankind's attempts to be "above the laws governing ordinary men" (*Ten* 240). Queen defies what Karnick calls "humanism, especially the notion that people can create valid moral systems without God" (3). By punishing his evil god-man character, Queen illustrates the Biblical truth that men who attempt to take the place of God ultimately fail. As a professor in one of Queen's novels tells Ellery, "There is one God; and there is none other but He" (qtd. in Karnick 61).

The Bible tells of an evil god-man's futile attempts to play the role of God. Christians refer to that evil god-man as the Antichrist, and Scripture refers to him as "that man of sin ... the son of perdition; Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God" (2 Thess. 2.3-4). While claiming to be God and possessing many traits that appear to be godly, the Scripture's Antichrist, like Diedrich Van Horn, is evil and ultimately will not be able to conceal his true wicked identity. The Bible continues, "And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume...and shall destroy" (2 Thess. 2.8). In all of Queen's books where an evil man plays the role of a god, that man's wickedness is revealed, bringing destruction to the character. Ellery says near the conclusion of *Ten Day's Wonder* in his confrontation with Diedrich, "I helped you commit these crimes, and we've both, in our fashion, got to pay the penalty" (244). Ellery then forces the evil god-man to commit suicide. In Biblical terms, "The wages of sin is death" (Rom. 6.23), and most certainly the wages of Diedrich's sin is death.

Nevins has a different perspective on Queen's evil god-man and a different explanation for the character's demise. Nevins says that because

the detective's human reason revealed the god character's evil nature, the "god" must die. "Therefore the forces of reason and humaneness demand the death of God" (*Royal* 136). Nevins maintains that if reason lives, God must die. Nevins' statement resembles the philosophies of Enlightenment scholars and even psychologist Sigmund Freud, who years ago, believed that reason would replace religion as the forces of reason grew (qtd. in Geary 297). However, Robert F. Geary, in his essay *On Horror and Religion*, points out that human religion and the "desire for the sacred" still exist very strongly in today's world (297).

Marvin Lachman, one of the first contributors to the *Armchair Detective Journal*, creates a story of the fictional meeting between famous religious detectives Father Brown and Rabbi Small in his article "Religion and Detection" (19). Based on the conversation in Lachman's story, Father Brown would also disagree with Nevins' theory that the forces of reason demand the death of God. Instead, Father Brown would argue that the death of God demands the death of reason. "Faith and belief in God don't cause man to lose his ability to reason. The contrary is true. The first effect of man's disbelief in God is his loss of common sense," says Father Brown (22). And the Bible points out the ignorance of disbelief in God by saying, "The fool hath said in his heart there is no God" (Ps. 4.1).

The detective's task requires utmost common sense, yet Detective Ellery Queen is unsure about religious matters and is described as "that lean and indefatigable agnostic" (*Lamp* 4). Although the cousins created Ellery Queen as an agnostic, their personal religious views remain unclear. The only clues a reader can gather to speculate on the cousins' religious views are that they both grew up in Jewish homes, they possessed an extensive knowledge of Scripture that consistently appears in their works, and they frequently put Ellery Queen in situations that the detective admits have the potential to make him "become permanently devout" (qtd in Nevins, 65). The conflicting religious views of author and detective date back to Sir Arthur Conan Doyle and Sherlock Holmes, according to the article "The Religious Views of Sherlock Holmes" by Applewhite Minyard. "Doyle actually went out of his way to make Holmes deny all belief in the supernatural," yet Doyle himself clung to the views of Spiritualism, says John Dickson Carr in his biography of Doyle (qtd in Minyard 199). Therefore, as Minyard continues, "The Holmes stories must themselves contribute in some way to advancing the cause of Spiritualism" (200). Although Manfred B. Lee and Frederic Dannay never publicly professed any one faith, the cousins' direct intention to include religious elements is "undeniable," according to Karnick. The critic maintains, "Dannay made his intentions very clear, stating, for example, that he conceived 1964's *And On The Eighth Day* after reading about the Dead Sea Scrolls and noting their parallels to the Gospels" (3).

The works of Queen and other detective authors indicate a union of

religious views and detective reason. Harry Kemelman's detective Rabbi Small and G.K. Chesterton's Father Brown exemplify the notion that both reason and faith should be important to them as detectives. "After all," Father Brown says, "reason, imagination and other great gifts of the mind emanate from God" (Lachman 22). Although detective fiction emphasizes the necessity of reason, the forces of religion remain strong throughout the genre. Father Brown states, "I know that people blame the Church for subordinating reason, but it's just the opposite. Only the Church on this earth makes reason really supreme, and the Church affirms that God himself is bound by reason" (21). Rabbi Small stresses that his religion "encourage[s] the questioning of everything, including matters of faith" (22). Likewise, the Old and New Testament admonish Judeo-Christian believers to have a reason for their faith and to be able to explain their faith's doctrine to skeptics. "Be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you" (I Pet. 3.15).

As Queen says, "This is a reasonable world, and everything that happens in it must have a reasonable explanation" (*Lamp* 4). Yet many times, Detective Queen interprets religious clues in order to find the reasonable explanation for his mysteries. Reason and faith both live in the pages of Ellery Queen's novels, and Karnick states that Queen knew "the great danger in reason divorced from religious faith" (3). In *Ten Days' Wonder*, religion is a part of the mystery; the reader has to understand religion in order to understand the clues and logically solve the puzzle. Detective Ellery Queen also relies on the religious clues to conclude with a seemingly brilliant deduction with Howard as the amnesiac murderer.

Ellery points out that Howard broke each of the Ten Commandments with "six acts, nine crimes...Nine of the ten worst crimes a man can commit, according to an authority a great deal older than [legal] statutes...an authority who's usually spelled with a capital G...God" (180). By sculpting the ancient gods, Howard broke the First and Second Commandments to "have no other gods before me" (Ex. 20.3) and to make no "graven image" (Ex. 20.4). By signing his name H. H. Waye, Howard took the Lord's name in vain, breaking the Third Commandment (Ex. 20.7). By desecrating his parents' graves on Sunday, Howard dishonored his parents and dishonored the Sabbath day, breaking the Fourth and Sixth Commandments (Ex. 20.8-12). By taking his father's \$25,000, Howard broke the Eighth Commandment "Thou shalt not steal" (Ex. 20.15). By having an affair with Sally, Howard committed adultery and coveted his neighbor's wife, disobeying the Seventh and Tenth Commandments (Ex. 20.14,17). By denying that he gave Ellery the necklace to pawn, Howard broke the Ninth Commandment "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor" (Ex. 20.16). Finally, by murdering Sally, he broke the Sixth Commandment, "Thou shalt not kill" (Ex. 20.13). Ellery explains his solution to the authorities, sending Howard to his suicidal death (181-182).

However, Queen misinterprets the religious clues, leading him to an inaccurate assumption and faulty accusation of the murderer. Confronting Deidrich with his crime, Queen reflects on the previous year "when I was delivering the death blows to Howard with the merciless perfection of my reasoning...while my reasoning had been merciless, it had been anything but perfect" (224). Queen tells Diedrich, "Your very choice of the Ten Commandments idea was a clue to you as the guiding mentality if only I'd had the brains to see it" (243). Ellery continues, "I helped you commit these crimes" (244). Ellery's faulty reason proves the fallibility of human logic, for even a skilled detective does not have the power to observe and see everything. "Now faith is...the evidence of things not seen" (Heb. 12.1). Religious faith might seem to be the opposite of observation since faith concerns things "not seen" while reason concerns things "seen." The Bible says, "There is a way that seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death" (Prov. 16.25). The reasonable explanation that seems right to Ellery Queen proves to be faulty and leads to the deaths of innocent Sally and Howard, and guilty Diedrich.

The final conflict found in detective fiction and the Bible is death versus salvation. Both death and salvation are conclusions to the mystery, because in order for the mystery to be solved, either the innocent must be saved or the guilty must die. In Scripture, death is necessary for salvation; before experiencing salvation, one must accept the death of Christ as the payment for sin. "...We were reconciled to God through the death of his Son..." (Rom. 5.10). The death of God is vital to traditional Christian doctrine. The Bible says that God's perfect logic planned to save sinners from death through the death of God incarnate. "But God commendeth His love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us" (Rom. 5.8). In detective fiction, three types of salvation exist according to Nelson: restored social balance, restored health or well-being, and retribution (Nelson 190-191). The only way to achieve salvation, to restore social balance, and to establish retribution in *Ten Days' Wonder* is to demand the death of Diedrich Van Horn.

The passing of time has contributed to the death of Ellery Queen's popularity. Karnick says that Queen's popularity has faded due to his "passion for truth...in this time of widespread belief that there are no real truths," according to Karnick (59). Karnick, writing in the late nineties, fails to realize that Queen's truths were most popular during the modern period that according to Harmon's *Handbook to Literature*, "revel(ed) in a dense and often unordered actuality as opposed to the practical and systematic" (326). The modernist period resembles this present age in which people do not accept the Bible as absolute truth. Father Brown and Rabbi Small both agree in Lachman's story that no one discusses religion anymore "because religion is no longer important to people" (23). Perhaps traditional Christian and Jewish doctrines are not as evident today, but the quest for

spirituality still seeps unmistakably into American culture and popular literature just as it did during the modernist period of literature. Literature will always find a way to feed humanity's hunger for the spiritual (Geary 300), and popular literature in America will especially satisfy that hunger.

Ellery Queen's works are valuable even still. He searched for truth during a time when answers were very hidden, and he offered his truth to society through themes that the Bible has communicated for thousands of years. The King James Version of the Bible, the Book of the Ages, stands as the highest type of literature, and Ellery Queen's detective fiction during the Golden Age prevailed as the most popular literature. Like the Bible, Queen's puzzles and solutions still meet humanity's need for answers—humanity's timeless need to see the hidden demystified, to see evil punished and good rewarded, to see reason and religious faith unite, and to see salvation overcome death. Through *Ten Day's Wonder* and other wondrous masterpieces, Queen illustrates the mysterious religious depths that detective fiction is capable of investigating. Perhaps Queen will, through the passing of time, attain the literary credit he deserves, "...and every man shall receive his own reward according to his own labour" (I Cor. 3.8). Before today's readers can gain a true appreciation of Queen's depth and a true understanding of the spirituality of detective fiction, they must investigate every Biblical clue. Readers must be detectives like Ellery Queen...in search of the truth.

Works Cited

- Boucher, Anthony. *Ellery Queen. A Double Profile*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1951.
- Breen, Jon L. Introduction. *Synod of Sleuths: Essays on Judeo-Christian Detective Fiction*. Ed. Jon L. Breen and Martin H. Greenberg. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow, 1990. v-viii.
- Bridges, Linda. "The Mystery as Novel of Manners." *National Review*, 44, 65-68. 20 Jan. 1992.
- Geary, Robert F. "On Horror and Religion." *Gothic Horror: A Reader's Guide from Poe to King and Beyond*. Ed. Clive Bloom. New York: St. Martin's, 1998. 287-301.
- Harmon, William and Holman, C. Hugh, eds. "Modern." *A Handbook to Literature*. 8th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2000. 325-326.
- Haycraft, Howard. "Queen, Ellery." *Twentieth Century Authors, A Biographical Dictionary*. Ed. Howard Haycraft and Stanley J. Kunitz. New York: H. W. Wilson, 1942. 1139.
- Hays, R. W. "Religion and the Detective Story." *Armchair Detective: A Quarterly Journal Devoted to the Appreciation of Mystery, Detective, & Suspense Fiction* 8 (1974): 24-26.
- The Holy Bible, King James Version. The Electronic Text Center*. Ed. David Seaman. 2000. Alderman Lib., U of Virginia. 13 Nov. 2000
<<http://etext.virginia.edu/kiv.browse.html>>.
- Karnick, S. T. "Mystery Men." *National Review*, 52, 59-61. 6 Mar. 2000.
- Kennedy, J. Gerald. "Edgar Allan Poe." *Mystery & Suspense Writers*. Vol. 2. Ed. Robin W. Winks. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1998. 750-755.
- Lachman, Marvin. "Religion and Detection." *Armchair Detective: A Quarterly Journal Devoted to the Appreciation of Mystery, Detective & Suspense Fiction* 1 (1967): 19-24.
- . "Religious Cults and the Mystery." *Synod of Sleuths: Essays on Judeo-Christian Detective Fiction*. Ed. Jon L. Breen and Martin H. Greenberg. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow, 1990. 99-101.
- Landrum, Larry N. *American Mystery and Detective Novels: A Reference Guide*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1999.
- Lauter, Paul, ed. *The Heath Anthology of American Literature*. Ed. Paul Lauter et al. 2nd ed. Vol. 2. Lexington: Heath, 1994.
- Mazzella, Anthony J. "Whatever Happened to Ellery Queen?" *Columbia Library Columns* 35.2 (1986): 25-34.
- Minyard, Applewhite. "The Religious Views of Sherlock Holmes." *The Baker Street Journal: an Irregular Quarterly of Sherlockiana* 39.4 (1989) 198-202.
- Nathan, Daniel. *The Golden Summer*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1953.
- Nelson, John Wiley. *Your God is Alive and Well and Appearing in Popular Culture*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976.
- Nevins, Francis M., Jr. *Royal Bloodline: Ellery Queen, Author and Detective*. Bowling Green: The Popular Press, 1974.
- Queen, Ellery. *The Adventures of Ellery Queen*. 1934. New York: Pocket Books Inc, 1941.
- . *The Detective Short Story: A Bibliography*. New York: Biblio and Tannen, 1969.
- . "The Lamp of God." *The New Adventures of Ellery Queen*. New York: Stokes, 1940.
- . *Ten Days' Wonder*. 1948. New York: Pocket Books, 1957.
- Rosenberg, Betty. *Genreflecting: A Guide to Reading Interests in Genre Fiction*. Littleton, CO:

Libraries Unlimited, 1982.

Ross, Michele. "Mystery Book Trends." *Christian Science Monitor*, 88(214), 10. 30 Sept. 1996.

MasterFILE Premier. 22 Feb. 2000. <<http://epnet.com>>.

Routley, Erik. *The Puritan Pleasures of the Detective Story*. London: Gollancz, 1972.

A STUDY OF GLOSSOLALIA

FROM A NEW TESTAMENT

PERSPECTIVE

JACOB D. MYERS

Introduction

There I sat, in a packed conference hall with twenty students from my youth group, wondering what I should do. The winter youth conference had gone extremely well to that point; good speakers, great music. However, everywhere I looked people were mumbling some strange words to themselves that I could not understand. Thus came my first encounter with the phenomenon of speaking in tongues. As I stared out at the perplexed teenagers entrusted to my care I frantically searched the recesses of my mind for a proper response. I recalled the admonitions Paul offered to the Christians at Corinth that uninterpreted tongues should not be allowed in the assembly. Yet these people were all praying in tongues. What would Paul say about that? Unclear as to what exactly to do, we waited out the rest of the service. Later I explained to them that speaking in tongues is typically not a Baptist practice. Why, I wondered? Are Baptists biblically correct on this position? Having experienced a calling into full-time Christian service, and contemplating that ministry would likely be within a Baptist context, I decided that this was an issue that I must examine for myself. If tongues are a legitimate practice that is generally rejected by Baptists, could I remain faithful to the Baptist mission? Such questions demanded answers, and the following examination is a culmination of my research.

The purpose of this thesis will be to attempt to answer the following questions: What exactly are tongues? Are tongues good or bad? Should tongues be practiced in the church today? What role do tongues serve in the Christian's life? Are *all* believers supposed to speak in tongues? Is there any biblical evidence to support the Pentecostal doctrine of tongues as initial evidence? Is there a biblical basis for the Pentecostal insistence on a special prayer language? Finally, is glossolalia something that should be sought or is it bestowed on certain individuals?

There are many approaches one can take when examining glossolalia.

For instance scholars may take a sociolinguistic, psychological, feministic, or theological approach, or any combination of these and other approaches. A thorough reading revealed that there exists an abundance of material on the issue of glossolalia and that, after surveying some of the various works in the field, I decided that the best pursuit was to analyze the issue of glossolalia from mainly a biblical perspective. However, one cannot enter into a serious study of glossolalia without an understanding of the perspective of glossolalia. Therefore, in an attempt to present a well-rounded study, the Pentecostal argument will also be presented.

As mentioned above, the main intention is to develop a better understanding of the issue of glossolalia as it is used, or misused, in Christianity. Therefore, because the Bible is arguably the best source from which to build a solid praxis within the church, it seems to be the best criterion to test this phenomenon. Despite all of the research in this field, setting the biblical text as the primary parameter for this thesis would still take the scope of this study too far. Therefore, this study has been further narrowed to the exegesis of New Testament texts which inform the issue of glossolalia. However, in order to broach the subject of glossolalia it is imperative that the thesis also include some historical argumentation both for and against the Pentecostal doctrines questioned above.

The methodology will be very systematic. We will deal with the issue of glossolalia and attempt to answer the above questions. The outline for this thesis will be as follows: introduction; the Pentecostal argument for tongues as initial evidence; examination of New Testament texts (including Acts, 1 Corinthians, and other New Testament references informing the issue); and conclusion (including an answering of the primary questions introduced at the outset).

Tongues as Initial Evidence

The issue of tongues as initial evidence of Spirit baptism is one of the most widely criticized aspects of Pentecostal theology. The Pentecostals who hold this view argue that the Pentecost event was the pattern which all Christians are to emulate. They see the event described by Luke in Acts 2:1-13 as the only mode by which Christians can be baptized by the Holy Spirit. In other words, Pentecostals view the Pentecost event as the standard by which all subsequent experiences are to be followed. When a believer is indeed filled with the Holy Spirit, then he or she must speak in tongues. As in Luke's account, speaking in tongues followed the baptism. Therefore, some Pentecostals argue that if one does not speak in tongues then that person has not been baptized by the Holy Spirit.

The first official public proclamation of this doctrine was espoused in

The Pentecostal Testimony, which was published in 1920.¹ The testimony reads, "We believe the speaking in tongues to be the bible [sic] evidence of the Baptism of the Holy Ghost. No one can truthfully say they have received the baptism according to God's word without speaking in tongues."² Following this proclamation, the rest of Christendom responded with contrary remarks. Frank D. Macchia, one of the leading scholars defending the Pentecostal perspective, notes that a tremendous amount of controversy has arisen concerning the claim that glossolalia is the initial evidence of Spirit baptism.³ Macchia could not be closer to the truth. The strident declarations of scholars holding the Pentecostal argument has been equally matched by scholars opposed to it. In our modern context though, some have made a concerted effort to reach a compromise between these two differing perspectives on the issue of tongues as initial evidence of Spirit baptism. In order to present each perspective fairly each view will be examined below.

The Pentecostal Argument

In the midst of this controversy, one might ask, "what is the use or purpose of tongues within Christianity?" Aimee Semple McPherson, founder of the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel, articulates a response to such a question.⁴ She notes that as one sees a barber's pole or a restaurant sign, one expects to find a barber or food respectively within each establishment. So, she says, is the purpose of tongues. When one is witness to the phenomenon of glossolalia, he/she expects to find the Holy Spirit within.⁵ The classic Pentecostal doctrine states that the two are inseparable. If one does not speak in tongues then that person does not have the Holy Spirit within them. As mentioned before, they believe that the tongues at Pentecost were a pattern for all "genuine" accounts of baptism by the Holy Spirit.⁶

At this juncture it is imperative that one first understands what the Pentecostals believe is the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Only then can the Pentecostal perspective on glossolalia as initial evidence of Spirit baptism be accurately presented. Conn suggests that the best articulation of this

¹ Lyman Kulathungam, "Why Tongues?" *Eastern Journal of Practical Theology* 6 (1992): 23.

² *Ibid.*

³ Frank D. Macchia, "Discerning the Spirit in Life: A review of God the Spirit by Michael Welker," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 10 (April 1997): 23.

⁴ Edward Engelbrech, "To Speak in a Tongue," *Concordia Journal* 22 (July 1996): 122.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ Luke Timothy Johnson, "Glossolalia and the Embarrassments of Experience," *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 2 (1997): 198.

concept, as affirmed by Pentecostal churches today, was contributed by R. A. Torrey.⁷ Torrey says:

A man may be regenerated by the Holy Spirit and still not be baptized with the Holy Spirit. In regeneration there is an impartation of life, and the one who receives it is saved; in the Baptism with the Holy Spirit there is an impartation of power and the one who receives it is fitted for service . . . But not every believer has the Baptism of the Holy Spirit, though every believer, as we shall see, may have. The Baptism with the Holy Spirit may be received immediately after the new birth—as e.g., in the household of Cornelius. In a normal state of the church every believer would have the Baptism with the Holy Spirit. . . .

In such a normal state of the church the Baptism with the Holy Spirit would be received immediately upon repentance and baptism into the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins (Acts 2:38). But the doctrine of the Baptism with the Holy Spirit has been so allowed to drop out of sight, and the church has had so little expectancy along this line for its young children, that a large portion of the church is in the position of the churches in Samaria and Ephesus, where someone has to come and call the attention of the mass of believers to their privilege in the Risen Christ and claim it for them. . . .

In every passage in the Bible in which the results of the Baptism with the Holy Spirit are mentioned they are related to testimony and to service. The Baptism with the Holy Spirit has no direct reference to cleansing from sin. It has to do with gifts of service rather than with graces of character. The steps by which one ordinarily receives the Baptism with the Holy Spirit are of such a character, and the Baptism with the Holy Spirit makes God so real that this Baptism is in most cases accompanied by a great moral uplift, or even a radical transformation, but the Baptism with the Holy Spirit is not in itself either an eradication of the carnal nature or cleansing from an impure heart. It is the impartation of supernatural power or gifts of service, and sometimes one may have rare gifts by the Spirit's power and few graces.⁸

This quotation reveals the Pentecostal doctrine of the baptism of the Holy Spirit. It is evident that for Pentecostals, regeneration is different from baptism of the Holy Spirit. Therefore, from their perspective, an individual can be truly saved and not be baptized by the Holy Spirit. Non-Pentecostals

⁷ Charles W. Conn, "Glossolalia and the Scriptures," ed. Wade H. Horton, *The Glossolalia Phenomenon* (Cleveland, TN: Pathway Press, 1966), 33.

⁸ R. A. Torrey, *What the Bible Teaches* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1933), 271-73, quoted by Conn, 33-4.

might wonder why some are baptized by the Holy Spirit and others are not. Pentecostals respond by stating that there are certain "prerequisites" that believers must fulfill in order for them to receive Spirit baptism.⁹ Conn lists such "prerequisites" as separation from the world, a life of devotion and dedication, an intense desire for spiritual fullness, prayer for the "endowment," and obedience.¹⁰ Now let us turn to why Pentecostals insist that glossolalia is the initial evidence of this phenomenon.

In an effort to present with the greatest accuracy the Pentecostal perspective of tongues as initial evidence of Spirit baptism one must appeal to the most able defenders of this doctrine. In keeping with this presupposition, the greatest proponents of this perspective are represented below. One of the most widely written scholars on the topic of tongues as initial evidence is Gary B. McGee. McGee deals with the issue of evidential tongues from a restorationist perspective.¹¹ According to Macchia, in this "restorationist perspective," one strives to "recover a lost or neglected aspect of apostolic experience, worship or proclamation."¹² Therefore, McGee's argument is that Christianity today has lost the proper perspective on tongues that was held by the apostles. He quotes an early Pentecostal editor, Thomas G. Atteberry, who writes, "this supernatural manifestation was intended by its Founder to abide in the Church continually as a proof to the world that she had a commission that was divine and that her work was of God."¹³

Pentecostals hold that the baptism of the Holy Spirit must be manifested by glossolalia because they discern that this is the pattern displayed in the book of Acts.¹⁴ They hold that Luke-Acts is the "most carefully designed book in all of biblical literature."¹⁵ Therefore, Pentecostals reject the way in which non-Pentecostal scholars have placed didactic literature (especially the Pauline epistles) above Acts.¹⁶ They contend that the historical accounts in Acts should be given more theological weight given Luke's method. In other words, due to their notion that Luke-Acts was so deliberately

⁹ *Ibid.*, 34.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 34-5.

¹¹ Gary B. McGee, "Early Pentecostal Hermeneutics: Tongues as Evidence in the Book of Acts," ed. Gary B. McGee, *Initial Evidence* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1991), 97.

¹² Frank D. Macchia, "The Question of Tongues as Initial Evidence," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 2 (April 1993): 118.

¹³ McGee, 101.

¹⁴ For the sake of clarity, in this section the assumptions made by Pentecostals regarding such patterns in Acts are taken at face value. In section three, we will ascertain what messages the relevant texts are actually saying. For now, however, the Pentecostal exegesis of Acts will be presented as is.

¹⁵ Roger Stronstad, "The Prophethood of All Believers: A Study in Luke's Charismatic Theology," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 16 (1999): 14.

¹⁶ McGee, "Early Pentecostal Hermeneutics," 111.

assembled, they feel it should receive more attention in the formulation of Church doctrines. Interpreting Acts, however, presents several hermeneutical challenges. First, the interpreter must observe that Luke-Acts is "selective history."¹⁷ Second, Luke-Acts must be set "into the historical context of Greco-Roman history."¹⁸ Third, the interpreter must observe "Luke's multiplex historical-didactic-theological purpose."¹⁹

This is good advice for, whether he or she wants to or not, the interpreter brings certain presuppositions to the texts. Stronstad feels that such preconceived ideas should be recognized from the outset and factored into the interpretation.²⁰ Obviously, in interpreting Acts both Pentecostals and non-Pentecostals bring certain assumptions to the interpretation of Acts.

When interpreting Scripture, it is imperative that the interpreter understand the authors' intentions, or purposes, for writing the document.²¹ The Pentecostal argument is that Luke's purposes in writing Luke-Acts were multifaceted but they deem his primary purpose was to record the spread of Christianity.²² They hold that Luke teaches by "precedents and patterns."²³ In other words, Luke purposely sets historical precedents, which justify certain actions as he lays out specific patterns, which are to be followed. In keeping with this argument, Stronstad notes:

For example, Peter's witness to Cornelius and his household (Acts 10:1-48) is the historical precedent which justifies the salvation of the Gentiles by grace apart from the works of the Law (Acts 15:6-11). The same episode also makes explicit the pattern for Spirit-baptism which Luke has earlier implied in his programmatic Pentecost narrative.²⁴

Pentecostals interpret the narrative events that unfold in the book of Acts as a pattern to be applied to the church today.

Within the Pentecostal argument for tongues as evidence of Spirit baptism also lies their perceived purpose of this experience. Conn argues that the purpose of this baptism is "to equip and empower the Christian witness for Christ."²⁵ Willis notes that "the act of speaking in tongues [is] to be a sign for the unbeliever and edification to the believer."²⁶ While Pentecostals leave room for interpretation for the "why" of evidential

¹⁷ Stronstad, 18.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹ Gordon D. Fee, "Hermeneutics and Historical Precedent: A Major Problem in Pentecostal Hermeneutics," *Perspectives on the New Pentecostalism* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1976), 125.

²² Stronstad, 23.

²³ *Ibid.*, 25.

²⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵ Conn, 31.

²⁶ Willis, 266.

tongues, the majority still insists on tongues as evidence of Spirit baptism.

In summary, it should be evident by this point that the purposes of glossolalia as the manifestation of Spirit baptism, in the Pentecostal understanding, are both to indicate that the individual does in fact have the Holy Spirit, and for the mobilization of that person for Christian service. Furthermore, one can see that Pentecostals do differentiate between regeneration and Spirit baptism. In studying the works of several significant Pentecostal scholars, we have seen that they wish to restore the unified belief in glossolalia as the manifestation of Spirit baptism. They hold that this belief was part of the early church's doctrine. Pentecostals also maintain the view that glossolalia must accompany Spirit baptism because they understand this as the pattern and precedent set in Luke-Acts. Lastly, we have seen that Pentecostals disagree concerning why tongues must accompany Spirit baptism; however, the majority do insist that tongues are the "proof" of the baptism in the Holy Spirit.

The Counter-Argument

Just as there are many Pentecostals who support the doctrine of tongues as initial evidence of Spirit baptism, so are there just as many non-Pentecostals opposed to it. Max Turner, a notable scholar who deals substantially with the issue of evidential tongues writes, "It is important to note that the tongues led to 'questions and confusion'—it is Peter's preaching which communicates the gospel."²⁷ Therefore, Turner argues that the event, which so many Pentecostals use as their "proof text" for evidential tongues (Acts 2:1-13) actually brought confusion. He holds that the "intelligible" proclamation of the gospel is the "true" evidence of the Holy Spirit's work.²⁸

There are a plethora of counter-arguments to the Pentecostal claim of evidential tongues. Therefore, only the most common and feasible arguments will be considered here. One objection to the doctrine of evidential tongues is that "the God of variety is not tied down to any one evidence."²⁹ Those who are opposed to tongues as the *only* evidence of Baptism in the Holy Spirit argue that it is contrary to the nature of God to limit the way in which God chooses to reveal God's self.³⁰ Closely related to this argument is another which states that "any one of the nine gifts of the spirit can be the evidence."³¹ Those who hold this argument view tongues as a gift of the Spirit and that each gift is only one manifestation of the same and one Spirit who disperses every gift. Another counter-argument to the

²⁷ Max Turner, "Spiritual Gifts: Then and Now," *Vox Evangelica* 15 (1985): 17.

²⁸ *Ibid.*

²⁹ Carl Brumback, *What Meaneth This?* (Springfield, MO, 1947), 247.

³⁰ *Ibid.*

³¹ *Ibid.*, 249.

Pentecostal claim is that love is the real evidence of Spirit baptism.³² Those who hold this view do so because all other gifts can be counter-fitted but love is matchless and therefore cannot be fraudulent. D. H. Dolman holds yet another argument against the Pentecostal claim in stating that faith requires no visible proof.³³ He comes to this conclusion because one accepts Jesus by faith, and faith is the same manner by which we should accept the Holy Spirit. Some non-Pentecostals refute the belief that glossolalia is proof of Spirit baptism by their conviction that "limiting of physical evidence to tongues produces fleshly extravagances."³⁴ In other words, the requirement of tongues speaking in order to prove the baptism of the Holy Spirit leads to a pursuit of the sign rather than the Spirit. One final counter-argument to the doctrine of glossolalia as initial evidence of Spirit baptism is taken from the words of the Apostle Paul. He said in 1 Corinthians 14:22, "Tongues, then, are a sign not for believers but for unbelievers . . ." (NRSV). In other words, those objecting to the Pentecostal doctrine take Paul literally to prove that tongues are not a sign of the baptism of the Holy Spirit, but a sign for non-believers. Now, how the Spirit is manifested by the believers is under much debate. There are obviously many dissenting opinions and counter-arguments to the Pentecostal claim of initial evidence. Amidst all of the debating, however, arguments representing a middle-ground are beginning to emerge.

The Emergence of a Middle Ground

While the majority of individuals are either strictly for or against the Pentecostal doctrine of tongues as initial evidence, some scholars have attempted to find a point of compromise on this highly controversial issue. Willis, while still supporting evidential tongues as an evidence of the baptism of the Holy Spirit, notes that it does not necessarily have to be *the* evidence:

There are other important evidences of the Baptism of the Holy Ghost. The Holy Spirit is to be a Paraclete or Comforter. He is to be a Teacher. He reveals the Son. He is to provide power for witnessing. These benefits as well as "the fruits of the Spirit" will also characterize the life of the baptized believer.³⁵

Although he is a major advocate of the Pentecostal perspective, Macchia does see some room for a compromised position. In his review of *Initial Evidence*, edited by Gary McGee, he notes "Lederle rightly criticizes the 'law of tongues' in which glossolalia is viewed as the 'sole and

³² *Ibid.*, 252.

³³ *Ibid.*

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 258.

³⁵ Lewis J. Willis, "Glossolalia in Perspective," ed. Wade H. Horton, *The Glossolalia Phenomenon* (Cleveland, TN: Pathway Press, 1966), 259-60.

necessary condition of Spirit baptism.”³⁶ Furthermore, Macchia even criticizes Pentecostals on their failure to compromise on this view, when he writes, “The major theological challenge for Pentecostals is how to channel the protest element in their spirituality into a constructive form of social renewal and ecumenical dialogue, in a way that is true to the spiritual and cultural openness of Acts.”³⁷ This is an enormous critique coming from arguably the greatest apologist for the Pentecostal perspective on tongues as initial evidence of Spirit baptism.

In short, it does appear that new ground is being broken between mainstream Protestants and Pentecostals. However, the issue of tongues as initial evidence is far from resolved. In order for one to seriously enter into this dialogue one must first have an adept understanding of the theological framework which makes up each side of the debate. To this end, let us now turn to the exegesis of the relevant New Testament texts, which will bring further illumination to the issue of glossolalia.

Exegesis of New Testament Texts

In order to formulate a New Testament theology about glossolalia, it is imperative that we first critically examine the New Testament texts and terms involved. The primary texts that deal specifically with glossolalia are: Acts 2:1-13; 2:38-39; 8:4-25; 9:1-19; 10:25-48; and 1 Corinthians chapters 12-14. Other selected passages from the Gospels of John and Mark, as well as Paul’s Epistle to the Romans, while not explicitly mentioning tongues, inform the New Testament understanding of glossolalia therefore, these texts will be examined. The primary phrase used to describe glossolalia, as already mentioned, comes from the Greek phrase, *glwvssai* *lalew*. The word *glw`ssa*, which can be translated as either “tongues” or “languages” is used in the New Testament a total of fifty times.³⁸ Another word that comes into consideration when exegeting New Testament texts concerning glossolalia is the word *diavlekto*”, which can also be translated as “language.” This word is used only six times in the New Testament.³⁹ It shall be determined from the following exegesis whether any cohesion between the various texts can be formulated. It may be that the student of this phenomenon must accept dissimilar information, and thereby come to an understanding of the “theologies” of glossolalia in the New Testament, as opposed to one, unified “theology.”

It has been noted, while some would disagree, that there were a variety of uses in the first century of the concept of glossolalia, and that all

³⁶ Macchia, 119.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 121.

³⁸ Kurt Aland, *Vollständige Konkordanz Zum Griechischen Neuen Testament*, vol. 2 (Spezialübersichten, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1978), 62-3.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 70-1.

references use the term *glossa* ambiguously to classify them all.⁴⁰ Johnson concurs, noting, "Tongues is used in different ways in the New Testament: as real languages (Acts 2:4; 6-8); as a form of prophecy (Acts 2:16-18); and as unintelligible utterances (1 Cor. 14:2, 6-11; and 14:3-5).⁴¹ In order to formulate such conclusions, textual interpretations must be made. Unfortunately, interpreters often interpret each text from their chosen perspective, rather than allowing the text to speak for itself. It is the focus of this exegesis to determine, to the greatest extent, what role glossolalia played in the New Testament.

Acts

The Acts of the Apostles is a primary source for Pentecostals regarding the issue of glossolalia. Virtually every Pentecostal scholar argues his or her point in favor of the use of glossolalia from the Book of Acts. Consequently, the majority of non-Pentecostal scholars refute the events in Acts in order to justify its dismissal from Christian experience. Some, like Johnson, argue that Luke manipulated the facts in Acts in order to emphasize the element of communication.⁴² However, such a perspective, while possibly true, does not promote a proper New Testament understanding of glossolalia. Therefore, let us now turn to the primary texts in question in order to illuminate this contested issue.

Acts 2:1-13

The Pentecost event, Acts 2:1-13, is the most utilized text regarding the use, or disuse, of glossolalia. Every scholar who attempts to deal with the issue of tongues must examine this passage in order to produce a work with any viability. The following is a critical analysis of the pericope.

Acts 2 begins with the disciples of Jesus gathered together praying. Verse 2 recounts the event: "And suddenly from heaven there came a sound like the rush of a violent wind, and it filled the entire house where they were sitting" (NRSV). This establishes the experience as one with supernatural origins. Verse three continues: "Divided tongues, as of fire, appeared among them, and a tongue rested on each of them" (NRSV). In the Greek text the words translated "divided tongues" are *diamerizomenai* and

⁴⁰ Roy J. Valencourt, "Paul's Perspective on Glossolalia," *A.M.E. Zion Quarterly Review* 105 (April 1993): 19.

⁴¹ Luke Timothy Johnson, "Tongues, Gift of," vol. 6, *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. David Noel Freedman (New York: Bantam Doubleday Dell Publishing Group, Inc., 1992), 596.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 597.

glw'ssa.⁴³

Acts chapter two, verse four begins the key controversy on the usage of glossolalia. Luke writes, "All of them were filled with the Holy Spirit⁴⁴ and began to speak in other languages, as the Spirit gave them ability" (NRSV). The actual phrase translated "to speak in other languages" in the NRSV is under great scrutiny. The phrase in Greek is: *lalei`n eJtevrαι` glwvssai`*,⁴⁵ which can be translated either "to speak in other languages" or "to speak in other tongues." The proper interpretation of the word, *glwvssa*, may not seem very important, but it plays a large role in the proper understanding of the text. Louw and Nida define *glw'ssa* as "a language, with the possible implication of its distinctive form."⁴⁶ However, some argue that *lalei`n eJtevrαι` glwvssai`* should not be translated "to speak in other languages."⁴⁷ Everts defines the *glwvssai`* practiced here as "ecstatic speech, empowered by the Holy Spirit."⁴⁸ However, she is refuted by Turner who writes concerning Acts 2:4, "There is no doubt that Luke considers the Pentecostal phenomenon which he designates as *heterais glossais lalein* to be *xenolalia*: the speaking of actual foreign languages."⁴⁹

While the choice of translating *glwvssai`* as "tongues" or "languages" may seem insignificant, this exegetical decision tremendously impacts the Pentecostal doctrine of tongues. If *glwvssai`* is translated as "tongues," like Everts suggests, then the modern Pentecostal understanding of glossolalia as ecstatic utterances is supported from this record in Acts. If *glwvssai`* is translated as "languages," however, then the modern phenomenon of glossolalia is unsubstantiated, for glossolalia as it is

⁴³ *diamerizovmenai* is a present, passive, participle, nonanative, feminine plural verb from *diamerivzw* which means "to be completely divided." *glwvssai`* is a nominative, feminine, plural noun from *glwvssa*, which is referring to the physical tongue that Luke is witness to.

⁴⁴ It is important to point out to the reader that the text reads "filled with the Holy Spirit." (*ejplhvshsan pavnte` pnevmato` aJgiovu`*). Nowhere in this pericope does Luke mention anything about being "baptized by the Holy Spirit."

⁴⁵ *lalei`n* is a present, active, infinitive verb from *lalevw* which literally means, "to speak." *glwvssai`* is a nominative, feminine, plural, noun from *glwvssa* which means, "tongues" or "languages."

⁴⁶ Johannes P. Louw and Eugene A. Nida, eds., "*glw'ssa*," *The Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains*, vol. 1, (New York: United Bible Societies, 1989), 389. See also H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, eds., "*glw'ssa*," *Greek-English Lexicon: With a Revised Supplement*, 9th ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 353 for the same rendering.

⁴⁷ Jenny Everts, "Tongues or languages," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 4 (April 1994): 72.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 71.

⁴⁹ Turner, 17.

practiced by Pentecostals is not an identifiable language.⁵⁰ If *glwvssai* " is translated as "languages" then the only pattern that can be legitimized by the Pentecost pericope is that the Holy Spirit enables individuals to speak in other languages in order to communicate the gospel. Everts insists that the "dynamic equivalence theory" be employed here.⁵¹

The dynamic equivalence theory is a tool which translators use to translate a given passage according to its actual meaning, rather than in the equivalent words.⁵² Therefore, this technique preserves the author's intended significance for each reader. Everts argues a very legitimate point in that the NRSV, in translating 2:4 as "languages," does much to subvert the Pentecostal claims.⁵³ However, some linguistic scholars have insisted on such a translation because the message was understood. Therefore, in their minds, the tongues spoken must have been languages.⁵⁴ Among English translations, the NRSV is the only translation out of the KJV, NIV, NAS, and Young's Literal Translation to use "languages" for *glwvssai* ".

Acts 2:5 reads, "Now there were devout Jews from every nation under heaven living in Jerusalem" (NRSV).⁵⁵ All of these individuals had come together to celebrate the Jewish feast of Pentecost. Verse six continues, "And at this sound the crowd gathered and was bewildered, because each one heard them speaking in the native language⁵⁶ of each" (NRSV). The use of the word *glwvssai* " in verse four and *dialevktw/* in verse six has become another issue of exegetical controversy. Some have argued that it is possible, though not probable that *diavlektō* " in Acts 2:6 may be understood not only as language as such, but as a particular form of such a language, and hence would have a meaning of "manner of speaking" or even "accent."⁵⁷ Some have suggested that the miracle in this event was the gift

⁵⁰ William J. Samarin, *Tongues of Men and Angels: The Religious Language of Pentecostalism* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1972), 73.

⁵¹ Everts, 71-2.

⁵² *Ibid.*

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 79.

⁵⁴ Louw and Nida, 389.

⁵⁵ In Greek the phrase *eujlabei`* " is a nominative, masculine, plural, adjective from *eujlabhv* " which means "pertaining to being reverent to God." Louw and Nida, 533.

⁵⁶ The word translated "language" here and in the KJV, NIV, and ASV is *dialevktw/* from *diavlektō* ", which is a locative, feminine, singular noun, which can be translated "dialect" or "language." Louw and Nida define *diavlektō* " as "a verbal code, whether oral or written, as a basic means of communication, 'language'" 389. See also, Joseph Henry Thayer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1889), 139. Thayer defines *diavlektō* " as "the tongue or language peculiar to any people."

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, C. S., Louw and Nida, 401 note that the word *la;lia*, as is closer to "accent" than *diavlektō* ".

of hearing and not of speaking.⁵⁸ Others disagree with this analysis given the use of the words *glw`ssa* and *diavlekto* together.⁵⁹ Everts suggests that the "hearing" was a one-time event, yet she insists that the speaking part was meant to be continued.⁶⁰ Based on the actual text, however, it is highly questionable how this can be a viable statement without seriously stretching one's interpretation.

Acts 2:8 reads, "And how is it that we hear, each of us, in our own native language?"⁶¹(NRSV) In Acts 2:8 *th` / ijdiva/ dialevktw/* must modify the verb of hearing, therefore they may have spoken in *glwvssai* " but the miracle was in the hearing of the *dialevktw/*.⁶² It is interesting to note that the word *diavlekto* " was translated "language" in 2:6 but in 2:8 the same word is translated "tongue" in the KJV. All other translations maintain a consistent rendering of the Greek word *diavlekto* " into their respective English translations.

The next verse that impacts our study is verse eleven of chapter two. This passage reads, "in our own languages"⁶³ we hear them speaking about God's deeds of power" (NRSV). It is interesting to note that the NRSV is the only translation that maintains "language" as the proper translation of *glwvssai* ". All other translations interpret this by using "tongues."

This pericope ends with verses twelve and thirteen, which read, "All were amazed and perplexed, saying to one another, 'What does this mean?' But others sneered and said, 'They are filled with new wine'" (NRSV). Turner comments that verse 13 indicates that Luke does not suggest that God allowed unbelievers the ability to interpret.⁶⁴ This argument is strengthened by the bystanders' accusation that the disciples were full of "new wine."⁶⁵ Obviously, the Pentecost pericope is a fundamental text for Pentecostals. However, there exists a great deal of textual variation that leaves room for a variety of interpretations.

Acts 2:38-39

For the sake of continuity, let us now deal with Acts 2:38-39. While this passage does not deal directly with the issue of glossolalia, it does shed

⁵⁸ Amos Young, "Tongues on Fire in the Pentecostal Imaginations," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 12 (April 1998): 44.

⁵⁹ Horst Balz and Gerhard Schneider, eds., *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*, vol. 1 (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1990), 307.

⁶⁰ Everts, 78.

⁶¹ In Greek this phrase is: *th` / ijdiva/ dialevktw/* .

⁶² Everts, 75.

⁶³ In Greek this word is *glwvssai* ".

⁶⁴ Turner, 17.

⁶⁵ In Greek this word is *gleuvkou* " from *gleu`ko* ", which can be translated as either new wine or sweet wine.

a great deal of light on the topic at hand. In this section of Scripture, Peter is concluding his speech to the onlookers at Jerusalem following the Pentecost experience. He says, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ so that your sins may be forgiven; and you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."⁶⁶ For the promise is for you, for your children, and for all who are far away, everyone whom the Lord our God calls to him" (NRSV). This passage presents an obvious problem for a Pentecostal interpretation of Acts because Peter is promising that *all* that repent and are baptized will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.⁶⁷ However, he does not mention anything about speaking in tongues. Therefore, one may deduce from this pericope that modern-day believers who repent and are baptized *will* receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. However, Peter does not suggest that *all* will speak in tongues, rather all who are baptized *will* receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.

Acts 8:4-25

It is important to include this pericope in our discussion of glossolalia. Although speaking in tongues is not mentioned, it does have a direct bearing on the issue in the minds of some scholars.⁶⁸ The main point of contention is evidenced in the fact that the believers did in fact receive the Holy Spirit and yet no mention of speaking in tongues is made. The text recounts the story of Philip proclaiming the gospel to the Samaritans. Luke tells us that the crowds openly received the message that Philip was proclaiming to them and many were baptized. Among them was Simon, a man who had previously practiced magic. Philip baptized Simon as well. Soon the news of the Samaritan conversions spread back to Jerusalem and the apostles decided to see what was going on. The text continues:

Now when the apostles at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had accepted the word of God, they sent Peter and John to them. The two went down and prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Spirit (for as yet the Spirit had not come upon any of them; they had only been baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus). Then Peter and John laid their hands on them, and they received the Holy Spirit (NRSV).

This passage of Scripture reveals that the receiving of the Holy Spirit is not

⁶⁶ In Greek the phrase "you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit" is *lhvmyesqe th;n dwrea;n tou` aJgiovu pnevmato`*. This is a promise that Peter is making. Once again it is imperative to point out that the phrase "baptized by the Holy Spirit" is not used here.

⁶⁷ William W. and Robert P. Menzies, *Spirit and Power: Foundations of Pentecostal Experience* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 2000), 79.

⁶⁸ James D. G. Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1970), 9.

always manifested by the speaking of tongues. The key reference is in verse 17, which reads, "Then Peter and John laid their hands on them, and they received the Holy Spirit" (NRSV). Nowhere in the text is it indicated that those in Samaria did in fact speak in tongues.

Acts 9:1-19

Another section within the book of Acts that informs the issue of glossolalia is found in chapter 9:1-19. This passage narrates Saul of Tarsus' conversion/call experience. The text begins with Saul in route to Damascus to arrest Christians there. Saul is blinded by a light and hears a voice, saying, "Saul, Saul, why do you persecute me?" He is then instructed to proceed to the city. Meanwhile, a Christian named Ananias received a vision from the Lord to go and lay hands on Saul so that he would be able to see. The passage continues:

So Ananias went and entered the house. He laid his hands on Saul and said, "Brother Saul, the Lord Jesus, who appeared to you on your way here, has sent me so that you may regain your sight and be filled with the Holy Spirit."⁶⁹ And immediately something like scales fell from his eyes, and his sight was restored. Then he got up and was baptized, and after taking some food, he regained his strength.

Notice that Saul, one of the heroes of Luke's account in Acts is filled with the Holy Spirit and yet the text records no instance of him speaking in tongues.

Acts 10:25-48

In this section of Acts, Peter is faced with the realization that the Gospel of Jesus Christ is available to both Jews and Gentiles. The sections of the pericope of particular importance for this study are verses forty-four through forty-eight. They read:

While Peter was still speaking, the Holy Spirit fell upon all who heard the word. The circumcised believers who had come with Peter were astounded that the gift of the Holy Spirit had been poured out even on the Gentiles, for they heard them speaking in tongues and extolling God. Then Peter said, "Can anyone withhold the water for baptizing these people who have received the Holy Spirit just as we have?" So he ordered them to be baptized in the name of Jesus

⁶⁹ Yet again the reader should be conscious of the language used here. Saul was not "baptized by the Holy Spirit" but was "filled with the Holy Spirit" (plhsqh /" pneuvmato" ajgivou). This is not a mere discussion of semantics but theological concern which shall be discussed later.

Christ. Then they invited him to stay for several days (NRSV).⁷⁰ It is clearly evident from this passage that the receiving of the Holy Spirit was indeed manifested by speaking in tongues. Pentecostals view Acts 10:45-46 as a “visible link between the Jewish and Gentile experience.”⁷¹ Both passages do reveal that when the individuals were filled with the Holy Spirit they did in fact speak in tongues. However, it is also important to regard the actual language used in the text. One cannot use this text to legitimize the argument that those baptized by the Holy Spirit must speak in tongues because we have no record here that the believers were in fact baptized by the Holy Spirit. We do know, however, that the “Holy Spirit came upon them, and they spoke in tongues” (NRSV).

Other Passages

Within the book of Acts there are other, shorter passages which inform the issue of glossolalia from a New Testament perspective. These passages include, but are not limited to Acts 19:1-7, 21:40, 22:2, and 26:14. Some of these passages deal with the usage of tongues as a manifestation of the Holy Spirit, which is the main concern for this study. Still others deal with Luke’s use of the Greek word *glossa* (glw`ssa) in other contexts.

In Acts 19:1-7, Paul has confronted a group of Christians in Ephesus. The text reads:

While Apollos was in Corinth, Paul passed through the interior regions and came to Ephesus, where he found some disciples. He said to them, “Did you receive the Holy Spirit when you became believers?” They replied, “No, we have not even heard that there is a Holy Spirit.” Then he said, “Into what then were you baptized?” They answered, “Into John’s baptism.” Paul said, “John baptized with the baptism of repentance, telling the people to believe in the one who was to come after him, that is, in Jesus.” On hearing this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. When Paul had laid his hands on them, the Holy Spirit came upon them, and they spoke in tongues⁷² and prophesied—altogether there were about twelve of them (NRSV).

It is obvious in this passage that glossolalia was in fact observed in conjunction with the coming of the Holy Spirit. Pentecostals see this as one example within the Acts account that affirms the association between

⁷⁰ In 10:46 the phrase is interpreted as “speaking *in* tongues” by the NIV and NRSV, however, the KJV, ASV, and Young’s Literal translation render it “speaking *with* tongues.” In Greek the phrase is *lalouvntwn glwssai*, which can be either locative or instrumental, therefore, either translation is possible.

⁷¹ Macchia, 119.

⁷² The Greek phrase used is similar to words used in other places in Acts (i.e. Acts 2:4, 2:11, etc.); *ejlavloun te glwvssai*. This is translated literally “to speak *in/with* tongues.”

glossolalia and Spirit baptism.

Two other passages that inform the issue of glossolalia in Acts are 21:40 and 22:2. In both verses Paul is in Jerusalem and he has just been granted permission to speak to the Jews there. Acts 21:40 reads: "When he had given him permission, Paul stood on the steps and motioned to the people for silence; and when there was a great hush, he addressed them in the Hebrew language" (NRSV). The issue that comes into question here is the use of the word "language." One would expect, given the way in which the NRSV rendered the word "language" in Acts 2:4 from the Greek word *glw`ssa*, that the same word was being used here. However, the word in Greek used to describe this "Hebrew language" is *dialevktw*.⁷³ In Acts 22:2, the text reads, "When they heard him addressing them in Hebrew, they became even more quiet" (NRSV). Once again the word *dialevktw* is used and this time the NRSV does not even render it into English.

It is interesting that within the entire New Testament the word *diavlekto* is used only six times. All six occurrences are found within the book of Acts.⁷⁴ This may possibly suggest that Luke was purposely using the word to contrast the use of the word *glw`ssa*, which has a much wider usage in the New Testament.⁷⁵ Other translations render the translation of *dialevktw* differently. For instance, the NIV, in Acts 22:2, also omits the translation into English, probably because it is implied. The KJV renders the word *dialevktw* as "tongue." Young's Literal Translation translates the word as "dialect." Finally, the ASV translates the word in both 21:40 and 22:2 as "language." This may not seem like a necessary point to bring up in our exegesis of Acts as it pertains to glossolalia. However, the point is that a different word is used to describe a spoken language (i.e. Hebrew or Aramaic) than is used to describe the phenomenon of speaking in tongues. Louw and Nida see an evident distinction here. In their lexicon they translate *diavlekto* as "a verbal code, whether oral or written, as a basic means of communication- 'language.'"⁷⁶ However, they see *glw`ssa* as bearing two meanings: an actual language that can be understood, and an undistinguishable utterance.⁷⁷ Likewise, Bauer views *diavlekto* as the language of a nation or region.⁷⁸ Whereas he translates *glw`ssa* as "the broken speech of persons

⁷³ *dialevktw* is a locative, feminine, singular noun from *diavlekto* which means "language" or "speech."

⁷⁴ Aland, 70-1.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 62-3.

⁷⁶ Louw and Nida, 389.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*

⁷⁸ W. Bauer, "Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur," *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* translated and edited by W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich (Chicago: University Press, 1957), 184.

in religious ecstasy.⁷⁹ Therefore, it appears that Luke has intentionally chosen the word *diavlekto* to signify actual spoken languages (i.e. Aramaic) as a juxtaposition to the word *glw`ssa* which he deems ecstatic utterances.

In Acts 26:14, the same situation arises as in Acts 21:40 and 22:2. Paul, in telling of his conversion/call experience, says, "When we had all fallen to the ground, I heard a voice saying to me in the Hebrew language, 'Saul, Saul, why are you persecuting me? It hurts you to kick against the goads'" (NRSV). The word used in this passage is once again *dialevktw*; therefore, it has the same explanation as mentioned in the above two pericopes. Bearing in mind that the same writer produced these "other passages" who wrote the main texts exegeted within this thesis, it is quite significant that he uses a different word to denote glossolalia and actual spoken languages. As the rendering bears heavily on our understanding of glossolalia from a New Testament perspective, the textual evidence most clearly suggests that *glw`ssa* are not actual languages.

Conclusion

Obviously, this is a great amount of material to deal with regarding the use of glossolalia in the book of Acts. Upon the careful exegesis detailed above, several important conclusions may be deduced. First, it is evident from the text that Luke, in Acts 10:46 and 19:6, "clearly intends to establish a connection between the *glwvssai* of Pentecost and the subsequent occurrences of *glwvssai* at Caesarea and Ephesus."⁸⁰ However, Luke does wish to make a distinction between *glwvssai* and *dialevktw*. Despite the arguments of some scholars that the two words are used interchangeably,⁸¹ it is clear that Luke is using these two words to convey two different meanings.⁸²

Second, tongues are also recorded in Acts 10:46 and 19:6. In neither instance does Luke comment that they were languages heard by other hearers.⁸³ Therefore, the argument that the same event which occurred at Pentecost was repeated exactly at Caesarea and Ephesus is not biblically grounded. There is a connection between the events, that connection being the speaking of tongues; however, the situations are different. Third, the fact that the Samaritan converts were indeed filled with the Holy Spirit and did not speak in tongues is substantial evidence to dissuade the Pentecostal

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 161.

⁸⁰ Everts, 73.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 74.

⁸² Given the infrequency of the word *dialevktw* in the New Testament, and especially in Luke, it seems more probable that Luke purposely distinguished between two different understandings in his variance in language usage. Contrast Turner, 17.

⁸³ Turner, 18.

instance that glossolalia must be present if the Holy Spirit has baptized an individual. Finally, it is clear from this exegesis of Acts that glossolalia functioned for Luke as a physical result of the filling of the Holy Spirit, not as a necessary proof of the baptism.

1 Corinthians

In continuing with our examination of glossolalia, it is imperative that we too examine 1 Corinthians. The situations that Paul met at Corinth were far different from those described by Luke in the book of Acts. Paul was faced with an obstinate congregation that seemed to do everything the hard way.⁸⁴ Consequently, he wrote this epistle to confront specific problems within the church. Luckily for them, Paul was persistent in his corrections of their praxis and theology. Paul writes about tongues within the context of Spiritual Gifts.

Chapter Twelve

Paul's discussion of glossolalia begins in chapter twelve. He begins in verse one by writing, "Now concerning spiritual gifts, brothers and sisters, I do not want you to be uninformed" (NRSV). He is stating his context from the outset of the discussion. In verse two he writes, "You know that when you were pagans,⁸⁵ you were enticed and led astray to idols that could not speak" (NRSV). In verses three through four, Paul writes, "Therefore I want you to understand that no one speaking by the Spirit of God ever says 'Let Jesus be cursed!' and no one can say 'Jesus is Lord' except by the Holy Spirit. Now there are varieties of gifts, but the same Spirit" (NRSV). It is obvious from this section that Paul is making a clear distinction here. He is setting up his argument, which is to be expected in Pauline writings, in order to effectively plead his case. He is qualifying the work of the Holy Spirit, noting that the work of the Spirit is in conjunction with that of Jesus Christ.⁸⁶ In other words, the workings of the Holy Spirit will be made manifest in keeping with Jesus' Lordship. Furthermore, Paul is asserting in verse four that all Spiritual Gifts are given by the same Spirit (i.e. the Holy Spirit) and that there are a variety of gifts. Apparently, Paul is responding to a situation in Corinth where the Christians there were assuming that a different spirit gave each gift.⁸⁷ Such a perspective is certainly in keeping with the ancient Greek religious frame of mind. In addition, it appears that

⁸⁴ William Barclay, *The Letters to the Corinthians* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1975), 2-3.

⁸⁵ The word translated pagans is *e ; qnh*, which is a nominative, neuter, plural noun which means "nations." In the plural it can be used to classify any non-Jews.

⁸⁶ See Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit*, 263.

⁸⁷ Turner, 27.

the congregation at Corinth was in dispute about there being different types of gifts. This effectively sets up Paul's argument to follow.

In verse five of chapter twelve he continues, "and there are varieties of services, but the same Lord" (NRSV). The phrase in Greek translated above as "varieties of services" is *diairevsei* "ejnerghmavtwn."⁸⁸ This is significant because the phrase signifies a different selection of operations. There is no doubt that Paul is legitimizing the fact that the Spirit gives multiple gifts, or ways of service, but they all come from the same Lord.⁸⁹ In keeping with the same principle Paul writes verses six through seven, "and there are varieties of activities, but it is the same God who activates all of them in everyone. To each is given the manifestation of the Spirit for the common good" (NRSV). Verse seven in particular contains a phrase which must be comprehended if one is to grasp fully the depth of Paul's reasoning in the following verses. He notes that the manifestation of the Spirit, both in gifts and ways of service, are for the "common good." In other words, all gifts in conjunction with each other and are used for the benefit of the Lord's work.⁹⁰

In verses eight through ten Paul lists several gifts that the Spirit manifests in believers. He reflects, "To one is given through the Spirit the utterance of wisdom, and to another the utterance of knowledge according to the same Spirit, to another faith by the same Spirit, to another gifts of healing by the one Spirit, to another the working of miracles, to another prophecy, to another the discernment of spirits, to another various kinds of tongues, to another the interpretation of tongues" (NRSV). In our dealings with the issue of glossolalia it is interesting to note that the gift of tongues is listed last in this series.⁹¹ Barrett suggests that "Paul's aim at the moment is not however to establish a rating of hierarchical gifts, but rather to insist that all gifts whatsoever important or unimportant, showy or obscure, come from the same source."⁹² Fee concurs, writing, "It is listed last not because it is 'least,' but because it is the problem. He always includes it, but at the end, after the greater concern for diversity has been heard."⁹³ As Paul makes evident in his further writings in chapters thirteen and fourteen, it is the use

⁸⁸ Louw and Nida, 512.

⁸⁹ G. D. Fee, "Gifts of the Spirit," *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, eds. Gerald F. Hawthorne and Ralph P. Martin (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1993), 342-43. See also Johnson, "Tongues, Gift of," 599.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*

⁹¹ C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1968), 286. Barrett notes, "it is probable that the Corinthians rated them [tongues] much higher."

⁹² *Ibid.*

⁹³ Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1987), 572.

of the gift of tongues that has caused disunity in the church at Corinth.⁹⁴ Therefore, in contrast to the suggestions of some scholars,⁹⁵ suggesting that he intentionally listed tongues last in order to de-emphasize their importance, it is a more plausible argument that Paul listed tongues last as a means of confronting their abuse in Corinth.

The phrase that has a special bearing on this study is "various kinds of tongues" (1 Cor. 12:10). What exactly does Paul mean by this statement? Furthermore, is that what Paul actually said? Some translations render this phrase differently. For instance, the New International Version includes a footnote after the word "tongues."⁹⁶ The footnote reads "or languages." In doing so the NIV treats the subject matter here exactly the same as the manifestation of tongues in Acts 2:4 and 11. Are the two related? The phrase in Greek is *gevnh glwssw`n* which literally means, "kinds of tongues." Each translation treats this phrase differently. The NIV adds the verb "speaking" before "tongues." However, this verb is not in the Greek text. Both the KJV and Young's Literal Translation add the word "diverse" before "kinds of tongues." Once again, this word is not in the Greek text. Both the ASV and NRSV insert the word "various" before the phrase in question. Evidently, the translators of each version have interpreted Paul's statement in order to describe what they perceive he is truly saying. Findlay has suggested that *gevnh glwssw`n* "implies that this ecstatic phenomenon was far from uniform, it differed from all recognizable speech."⁹⁷ Valencourt notes that the use of the phrase *gevnh glwssw`n* or kinds of tongues shows that there are varying uses of tongues.⁹⁸ However, due to the ambivalence of the translation of the word *glw`ssa*, it is presumptuous to draw such a conclusion; when it is just as possible that Paul is noting that the Spirit gives the gift of speaking various languages.⁹⁹ Despite the contrasting interpretations, Fee points out, and rightly so, that this exegetical ambiguity is, in effect, irrelevant.¹⁰⁰ The point is that *gevnh glwssw`n* was not understood and hence needed interpretation as will be seen below. As Fee notes, "Paul's whole argument is predicated on its [tongues'] unintelligibility to both speaker and hearer."¹⁰¹ Therefore, it really does not

⁹⁴ S. J. Hafemann, "Corinthians, Letters to the," eds. Gerald F. Hawthorne and Ralph P. Martin, *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1993), 174.

⁹⁵ Johnson, "Tongues, Gift of," 600.

⁹⁶ International Bible Society, *The New International Version of the Holy Bible*, (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1992), 1250.

⁹⁷ G. G. Findlay, "St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians," in *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, ed. W. Robertson Nicoll, vol. 2 (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, no date given), 889.

⁹⁸ Roy J. Valencourt, "Paul's Perspective on Glossolalia," *A.M.E. Zion Quarterly Review* 105 (April 1993), 20.

⁹⁹ Louw and Nida, 389. See also Liddell and Scott, 353.

¹⁰⁰ Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 598.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*

matter whether Paul was referencing the speaking of ecstatic utterances or actual languages, in both instances they were not comprehended and hence led to the confusion within the assembly.

In verse eleven of chapter twelve we find a recapitulation of Paul's teaching thus far. He writes, "All these are activated by one and the same Spirit, who allots to each one individually just as the Spirit chooses" (NRSV). This verse sheds a great deal of light on two of our primary questions: should all Christians speak in tongues? and should tongues be practiced until they are a natural experience for the believer? Some Pentecostals argue that glossolalia should be practiced in order to be perfected by the believer.¹⁰² Contrarily, Paul notes that the gifts are given by the Spirit to whom the Spirit chooses. In other words, as Barrett and Finlay mention, the Holy Spirit controls the gifts and their dispersion but not the individual believer.¹⁰³ It appears that this verse provides a legitimate counterargument to the Pentecostal notions that either all Christians should speak in tongues or that tongues should be practiced, until they are perfected. This doctrine, supported by some Pentecostals, stands in direct opposition to Paul's statement in verse eleven. In other words, Paul argues that the Spirit disperses gifts to whom the Spirit chooses. Therefore, the Pentecostal assertion that tongues should be practiced until they are mastered is unfounded based on this pericope.

In verses twelve through twenty-six, Paul unfolds the bulk of his argument for curbing the Corinthian understanding of Spiritual Gifts. He writes:

For just as the body is one and has many members, and all the members of the body, though many, are one body, so it is with Christ. For in the one Spirit we were all baptized into one body—Jews or Greeks, slaves or free—and we were all made to drink of one Spirit. Indeed, the body does not consist of one member but of many. If the foot would say, "Because I am not a hand, I do not belong to the body," that would not make it any less a part of the body. And if the ear would say, "Because I am not an eye, I do not belong to the body," that would not make it any less a part of the body. If the whole body were an eye, where would the hearing be? If the whole body were hearing, where would the sense of smell be? But as it is, God arranged the members in the body, each one of them, as he chose. If all were a single member, where would the body be? As it is, there are many members, yet one body. The eye cannot say to the hand, "I have no need of you," nor again the head to the feet, "I have no need of you." On the contrary, the members of the body that seem to be weaker are indispensable, and

¹⁰² e.g. Van Unnik (found in Hemphill, *Pauline Concept of Charisma*, 124) quoted by Turner, 32. Turner lists Van Unnik as a Pentecostal scholar who argues that tongues should be "practiced zealously."

¹⁰³ Barrett, *Corinthians*, 286 and Finlay, 889.

those members of the body that we think less honorable we clothe with greater honor, and our less respectable members are treated with greater respect; whereas our more respectable members do not need this. But God has so arranged the body, giving the greater honor to the inferior member, that there may be no dissension within the body, but the members may have the same care for one another. If one member suffers, all suffer together with it; if one member is honored, all rejoice together with it (NRSV).

This is the main thrust of Paul's argument. He desires for the Christians at Corinth to have a proper understanding of glossolalia in light of the unity necessary for a healthy congregation. Note in verse thirteen that Paul says, "we were *all* baptized into one body" [*italics mine*]. His point is that we are all partakers in one baptism and yet not everyone has the same gift.¹⁰⁴

Paul continues in his argument in verses twenty-seven through twenty-eight: "Now you are the body of Christ and individually members of it. And God has appointed in the church first apostles, second prophets, third teachers; then deeds of power, then gifts of healing, forms of assistance, forms of leadership, various kinds of tongues" (NRSV). Once again Paul lists tongues as the last gift in his ordering of them. Some argue that this, being the second instance in which he lists tongues last, reveals that Paul does not view tongues as one of the top gifts.¹⁰⁵ This view is contrasted by Fee; however, in stating that in being listed last, it seems out of place. He notes, "It is not at the bottom of a descending list but is finally included in a truly heterogeneous listing of gifts and ministries in the church."¹⁰⁶ Fee, who is worth quoting in full, offers six definitive reasons why such a "ranking" of the gifts is inappropriate. He writes:

- (1) Paul's own emphasis throughout the preceding argument is consistently on the need for diversity, not on ranking some gifts as "greater" than others. (2) This is confirmed by the rhetoric of vv. 29-30, which quite disregards any concern for rank, and has only to do with variety. (3) By the same reasoning that puts tongues as the least, "apostles" should be the "greater" gift, yet all are agreed that this is the one gift that none of them may properly "eagerly desire." (4) Although prophecy is used as the primary example of intelligibility in chap. 14, its place in the two lists in chap. 12 is ambiguous—sixth on the first one, second on the other. (5) The lack of concern for ranking is manifest by Paul's failure to include five of the nine items from the first list in the second one; and of the four he does include, the first three are in reverse order. (6) Such a

¹⁰⁴ See Barclay, 114-5 for a wonderful reiteration of Paul's argument here.

¹⁰⁵ Several scholars draw this conclusion, i.e. Johnson, "Tongues, Gift of," 600, Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit*, 47-52, and Finlay, 895.

¹⁰⁶ Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 622.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 623.

view seems to run full in the face of the concern in the second application of the body imagery (vv. 21-26), where Paul stressed their mutual interdependence, no one being 'superior' to others.¹⁰⁷

In light of both sides on this exegetical issue, it appears most probable that Paul intentionally listed tongues near the bottom of the list in an attempt to contrast the way in which the Corinthians would have viewed them. They are not necessarily the least of the gifts, though they certainly do not hold the position attributed to them by the Corinthians as perceived from Paul's writing. Yet, the mere fact that they are even included in the list overwhelmingly defends glossolalia as having a role within the charismata.

Paul ends in chapter twelve with this admonition, "Are all apostles? Are all prophets? Are all teachers? Do all work miracles? Do all possess gifts of healing? Do all speak in tongues? Do all interpret? But strive for the greater gifts."¹⁰⁸ And I will show you a more excellent way" (NRSV). Here Paul sets up a series of rhetorical questions in order to show how ridiculous the presumptions are that the Corinthians are advocating. Fee reiterates Paul's argument, saying:

"Are all one thing? Do all function with the same ministry?" The intended answer is, "Of course not." Paul's point, then, is: "Correct, so why don't you apply this to yourselves and your singular zeal for the gift of tongues?" Tongues are fine, he will go on to affirm, provided they are interpreted. But not everyone should speak in tongues when the church assembles for worship. That makes everyone the same, which is like a body with only one part.¹⁰⁹

The Corinthians were probably advocating that all should speak in tongues, hence the need for Paul's guidance and correction.¹¹⁰ For that reason, as Fee suggests, Paul concludes the first phase of his argument only to continue in Chapter 13 with the qualifying mark of all spiritual gifts—love. He ends this chapter with a promise that he will fulfill in chapter thirteen.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.* Fee points out that this imperative to "strive for the greater gifts" presents a "puzzle" for the exegesis of 1 Corinthians 12:31 in light of the argument of vv. 4-30 and the rhetoric of vv. 29-30. Most have read v. 28 as a "ranking [of] the various gifts and ministries" based on a "misunderstanding of Paul's use of *meizōna*" in v. 28. The most probable reason for this issue is that the verb "strive" is in fact an imperative, but it does not stand in contrast to either 12:4-30 or the preceding listing of gifts. Rather, the preceding argument "has concluded that with the rhetoric of vv. 29-30" and with these words, Paul is preparing for the next argument, namely 14:1-25 in which he asserts the need for "intelligibility" in the assembly (624-5).

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 622.

¹¹⁰ See Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 541. See also Fee, "Gifts of the Spirit," 343.

Chapter Thirteen

Paul continues his argument from chapter twelve directly into chapter thirteen. Whereas Paul does not speak directly to the phenomenon of glossolalia, he does lay out the proper motive for the exercising of Spiritual Gifts—love.¹¹¹ Paul is not concerned with disregarding the gift of tongues (see 14:5); however, he wants them to be used in the proper context, and for the right motive.¹¹² That “right motive,” in Paul’s mind is love. One scholar noted, “Love distinguishes those on an ego trip from sincere Christians.”¹¹³ This “ego trip” is exactly what Paul wanted to correct in Corinth. He was attempting to change their motives.¹¹⁴ Findlay notes, “With love in the speaker, his *glwssolali;a* would be kept within the bonds of edification (xiv. 6, 12-19, 27), and would possess a tone and pathos different from that described.”¹¹⁵ Therefore, if Paul could change their motive for exercising spiritual gifts, the “disorder” within the assembly would take care of itself.

He begins this pericope with verse one, saying, “If I speak in the tongues of mortals¹¹⁶ and of angels,¹¹⁷ but do not have love, I am a noisy gong or a clanging cymbal” (NRSV).¹¹⁸ It is not by accident that Paul addresses the use of tongues first. In fact it is in keeping with his curbing of the use of glossolalia throughout chapter twelve. The word used in Greek, which is here translated as “tongues,” is once again *glwvssai*.”

As in all instances this word can be rendered as “tongues” or “languages” in English. However, Paul does put a qualifier on *glwvssai*” in this instance. He uses the word *glwvssai*” in the context of tongues of men or of angels. This is very significant; because it is plausible that Paul is referring to xenoglossolalia—the speaking of actual foreign languages, as opposed to the ordered babbling often identified with

¹¹¹ Turner, 28.

¹¹² See Barrett, *Corinthians*, 299-311 especially for a great rendering of this motif.

¹¹³ K. Stendahl, “Glossolalia and the Charismatic Movement,” *God’s Christ and His People*, ed. J. Jervell and W. Meeks (Oslo: Universitets forlaget, 1977), 124.

¹¹⁴ Turner, 28.

¹¹⁵ Findlay, 896.

¹¹⁶ This has been argued as foreign languages, see Conn, 37 and as “ecstatic and inarticulate forms of speech, such as ‘men’ do sometimes exercise,” see Findlay, 896. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 630, views this as human speech unknown to the speaker, contrasted both to foreign languages and ecstatic utterances.

¹¹⁷ Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 630 reflects an understanding that the speaker was communicating in “the dialect(s) of heaven.”

¹¹⁸ Paul shifts to the first person singular to draw the Corinthians into the argument. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 630 notes that this shift could reflect their “disapproval” of him for not being very spiritual (see 1 Cor. 2:15).

Corinth.¹¹⁹ However, this qualifier before tongues was probably a representation of differing views as to what tongues actually were.¹²⁰ The point remains though, that the tongues, whether human languages, heavenly languages, or ecstatic utterances, were not understandable to anyone and were adding to the conflict at Corinth.

Paul continues through the rest of the chapter to write about love as the proper basis upon which Spiritual Gifts should be predicated:

And if I have prophetic powers, and understand all mysteries and all knowledge, and if I have all faith, so as to remove mountains, but do not have love, I am nothing. If I give away all my possessions, and if I hand over my body so that I may boast, but do not have love, I gain nothing. Love is patient; love is kind; love is not envious or boastful or arrogant or rude. It does not insist on its own way; it is not irritable or resentful; it does not rejoice in wrongdoing, but rejoices in the truth. It bears all things, believes all things, hopes all things, endures all things, Love never ends. But as for prophecies, they will come to an end; as for tongues, they will cease; as for knowledge, it will come to an end. For we know only in part, and we prophesy only in part; but when the complete comes, the partial will come to an end. When I was a child, I spoke like a child, I thought like a child, I reasoned like a child; when I became an adult, I put an end to childish ways. For now we see in a mirror, dimly, but then we will see face to face. Now I know only in part; then I will know fully, even as I have been fully known. And now faith, hope, and love abide, these three; and the greatest of these is love (NRSV).

One area of difficulty for Pentecostal scholars is found in the exegesis of verses eight through twelve. Here Paul says plainly, "as for tongues, they will cease"(v.8). He then goes on to explain that such gifts are necessary then but will become obsolete in the future. The question is when will they become unnecessary? Some dispensationalists argue that with the canonization of Scripture, such Spiritual Gifts were no longer necessary.¹²¹ However, Turner argues that such a view is "exegetically indefensible" and "is not held in serious New Testament scholarship."¹²² Given the stark contrast between the condition of knowledge for the Corinthians and the type of knowledge that will come to pass, it is most feasible to hold that Paul is speaking of the Parousia.¹²³ Turner concludes, "Only an eschatological interpretation of verses 8-12 satisfactorily accounts for Paul's

¹¹⁹ See C.M. Roebuck Jr., "Tongues," *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, eds. Gerald F. Hawthorne and Ralph P. Martin (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1993), 940-1. He gives some background to the charismatic situation at Corinth.

¹²⁰ Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 630.

¹²¹ Horton, 214.

¹²² Turner, 38.

¹²³ *Ibid.*, 39.

language.¹²⁴ Barrett notes that prophecy “is the inspired declaration of the truth about God and his will vanishes in the presence of God himself.”¹²⁵ “Tongues,” he defines, are “indirect and mysterious communication about God, in God’s presence [i.e. the Parousia] it will be unnecessary.”¹²⁶ In short, the point cannot be made within the bounds of serious New Testament scholarship that tongues should not be practiced today based on a reading of the above passages of Scripture. Such a view is simply exegetically indefensible.¹²⁷ However, this saying of Paul should not gain a higher place in this exegesis than Paul’s primary point that Spiritual Gifts must be exercised in love.

Chapter Fourteen

In chapter fourteen Paul concludes his rebuke of the Christians at Corinth concerning Spiritual Gifts, particularly their “unbridled use of tongues in the assembly.”¹²⁸ Verse one reads, “Pursue love and strive for the spiritual gifts¹²⁹, and especially that you may prophesy” (NRSV). This verse connects his statements in chapter thirteen with what is to follow in chapter fourteen.¹³⁰ As Findlay observes, “the gifts are now reapplied via the medium of love.”¹³¹ Once again, Paul subjugates uninterpreted tongues to the gift of prophesy for the betterment of the assembly, which he deems a more needful gift more maintaining unity through diversity.¹³²

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, contrast this interpretation with Johnson, “Glossolalia and the Embarrassments of Experience,” 125. He argues that Paul is attempting to get rid of tongues and when he mentions that “they will pass away,” he means immediately. See also Roebeck, 941 for the same rendering as Johnson.

¹²⁵ Barrett, *Corinthians*, 305.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.* See also Conn, 62, like most Pentecostals hold this view which is exegetically the most feasible. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 645 notes that “face to face” refers to the eschaton.

¹²⁷ See Findlay, 900-01, Barrett, *Corinthians*, 305-6, and Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 645-6.

¹²⁸ Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 652.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, 654, Fee notes that this verse completes a chiasmic structure in Paul’s argumentation. This is necessary to point out to the reader because it links Paul’s argument between chs. 12-14 in a way which greatly defends the conclusions thus far. He breaks down the chiasm as follows:

(12:31) Be zealous for ta; carismata	A	
Yet I point to the superior way		B
(13) Description/exhortation on love		C
(14:1) Pursue love	B'	
Be zealous for ta; pneumatika;	A'	

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, 653 See also Barrett, *Corinthians*, 315.

¹³¹ Findlay, 902.

¹³² Barrett, *Corinthians*, 315.

Verse two continues, "For those who speak in a tongue do not speak to other people but to God; for nobody understands them, since they are speaking mysteries in the Spirit" (NRSV). The exegesis of this verse sheds a great deal of light on the subject of glossolalia. The phrase, "those who speak in a tongue," in Greek is *lalew'n glw;ssh/*. This literally means "the ones speaking in a tongue." In both the King James Version and Young's Literal Translation this passage is translated as "those speaking in an unknown tongue." The word unknown is not in the Greek text. Clearly the writers of these translations sought to interpret Paul's statement as pertaining to the Pentecost event. The NIV, in keeping with their pattern, adds a footnote including the translation of "language." It is important to restate that Paul views those who speak in tongues as speaking only to God, for their words are to others as *mysth;ria* (mysteries). In other words, no one understands them.

In verse three he contrasts glossolalia with prophecy: "On the other hand, those who prophesy speak to other people for their upbuilding and encouragement and consolation" (NRSV). This verse stands in contrast to the previous one. It is apparent that Paul sees the proper function of Spiritual Gifts to be used to better the community of believers.¹³³ Some scholars have argued that tongues are therefore, not as beneficial as other gifts because they are not used to build up the assembly.¹³⁴ In a resistance to the inclination of some scholars to take Paul's words here too far, Barrett notes, "It is not to be thought that speaking with tongues does no good, but the good it does is limited by the failure of the congregation at large to understand what is said."¹³⁵ However, others have suggested that such a conclusion is premature because tongues can be used for "encouragement and consolation" within the church which can indirectly bring edification to the assembly.¹³⁶ However, the former view by Barrett appears to be more in line with Paul's actual message in verse three.

Verses four through eight continue this line of reasoning: "Those who speak in a tongue build up themselves, but those who prophesy build up the church. Now I would like all of you to speak in tongues, but even more to prophesy. One who prophesies is greater than one who speaks in tongues, unless someone interprets, so that the church may be built up" (NRSV). In

¹³³ This is evidenced by Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 655. See also 658 where H. W. House argues that some say this statement is "merely conciliatory in light of 12:28-30 where he argues all will not speak in tongues. However, Fee contrasts this view with his own that Paul wishes all could experience the joy of tongues speaking in their personal prayer life, 658.

¹³⁴ See F. W. Horn, "Holy Spirit," *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, vol. 6, David Noel Freedman, Ed. (New York: Bantam Doubleday Dell Publishing Group, Inc., 1992), 277. See also Turner, 21.

¹³⁵ Barrett, *Corinthians*, 316.

¹³⁶ James D. G. Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1975), 229.

Paul's rhetoric, prophecy is better than uninterpreted tongues for the congregation because the latter does not build up the church. An interesting translation issue becomes apparent in verses four and five. In verse four, the NIV, includes a footnote after the word "tongue" which reads "another language" [italics mine]. Yet in the same, in verse five the footnote reads "other languages" [italics mine]. The interpretation is even more deliberate in both Young's Literal Translation and the KJV. Verse five is translated as "tongues" but in verse four, *glw;ssh* is translated as "unknown tongues." Exegetically this is inconsistent since the same phrase is used in both instances. It is obvious that the translators wish to make a theological statement here rather than just translate the text.

In verses six through ten Paul continues with his argument for the superiority of prophecy over uninterpreted glossolalia for the edification of the assembly:

Now, brothers and sisters,¹³⁷ if I come to you speaking in tongues, how will I benefit you unless I speak to you in some revelation or knowledge or prophecy or teaching? It is the same way with lifeless instruments that produce sound, such as the flute or the harp. If they do not give distinct notes, how will anyone know what is being played? And if the bugle gives an indistinct sound, who will get ready for battle? So with yourselves; if in a tongue you utter speech that is not intelligible,¹³⁸ how will anyone know what is being said? For you will be speaking into the air. There are doubtless many different kinds of sounds in the world, and nothing is without sound (NRSV).

It is evident from these statements that it is not beneficial to speak merely in tongues within the assembly unless one has a useful word to impart. Paul compares tongues again to a flute, harp and trumpet, which can only be useful if the individual notes or sounds can be understood by those around. Findlay observes that Paul has assumed the role of one speaking in glossolalia while the congregates at Corinth assume the hypothetical role of the observers striving to discern him.¹³⁹ Findlay writes, "Paul has just asked what the Corinthians would think of him, if in their present need he came exhibiting his power as a speaker with Tongues, but without a word of prophetic inspiration or wise teaching to offer."¹⁴⁰ In response, they would be appalled at his lack of concern for their situation. Paul, for all practical purposes, refuses to "come to them speaking in tongues" because such a

¹³⁷ Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 661, points out that the use of the vocative in "brothers and sisters" indicates a turn in the argument. However, more accurate to classify this as a reiteration of a continuous argument rather than a new one.

¹³⁸ The phrase used to derive this translation is *eu~shmon lojgon*, which means "a well defined word."

¹³⁹ Findlay, 904.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

spectacle would “not profit them.”¹⁴¹ Unlike the exegesis of some scholars,¹⁴² the exegesis that best matches Paul’s true intentions in verses 6-10 is that, within the church, one should be respectful of the needs of those observing rather than selfishly speaking in tongues, for this will not benefit the observers.

Paul continues in verses twelve through fourteen:

If then I do not know the meaning of a sound, I will be a foreigner to the speaker and the speaker a foreigner to me. So with yourselves; since you are eager for spiritual gifts,¹⁴³ strive to excel in them for building up the church. Therefore, one who speaks in a tongue should pray for the power to interpret. For if I pray in a tongue, my spirit prays but my mind is unproductive (NRSV).

This pericope is somewhat ambiguous because, as Barrett notes, Paul is combining several thoughts into one sentence.¹⁴⁴ In this section we discover more about the Corinthians. Primarily, the foreigner-native motif employed here unmistakably places glossolalia within the context of what is beneficial to the assembly (1 Cor. 14:12). Conn, arguing for the Pentecostal exegesis of 14:12-14 notes that the function of tongues is “praise and adoration.”¹⁴⁵ He justifies their use as personal in nature rather than congregational.¹⁴⁶ It also appears that they are zealous for gifts or spiritual experiences, Paul then is trying to curb what they were previously doing, and directing them to pursue the gift of prophecy, if they must desire a gift, with equal fervency for the betterment of the assembly.

In 1 Corinthians 14:15-17 we read:

What should I do then? I will pray with the spirit, but I will pray with the mind also; I will sing praise with the spirit,¹⁴⁷ but I will sing praise with the mind also. Otherwise, if you say a blessing with the spirit, how can anyone in the position of an outsider say the “Amen” to

¹⁴¹ Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 662. For the same rendering from a more mainline Pentecostal perspective see Bob Zerhusen, “The Problem Tongues in 1 Cor. 14,” *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 27 (Winter 1997): 140.

¹⁴² Johnson, “Tongues, Gift of,” 600.

¹⁴³ Dunn, *The Theology of the Apostle Paul*, 409, argues that they were not striving for “spiritual gifts” and this is a poor rendering of *pneuma*; *ta*, but instead “eagerness for experiences of inspiration,” especially but not limited to glossolalia. See also Fee, *Empowering Presence*, 227, for the same rendering.

¹⁴⁴ Barrett, *Corinthians*, 319-20. It is clear that Paul’s main concern is for the members to edify the assembly over and above themselves. It is not intrinsically bad that one’s mind is unproductive because, he argues, the Spirit supersedes the mind. These verses must be read within the context of all of 1 Cor. 12-14 drawing from the body analogy (12:12-26), the love argument (13:1-13) and the instrument analogy (14:7-8).

¹⁴⁵ Conn, 63.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 64.

¹⁴⁷ “Spirit” here is *anartharous*, see Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 620.

your thanksgiving,¹⁴⁸ since the outsider does not know what you are saying? For you may give thanks well enough, but the other person is not built up (NRSV).

Some have argued that it is Paul's conviction that the mind and spirit should work together in order that others should be edified.¹⁴⁹ However, with speaking in tongues the only one who is edified is the speaker. In verse fifteen Paul sets up the rhetorical question, "what should I do then?" He answers his own question by proclaiming that he will do both. He will pray in the Greek vernacular for the sake of others and he will pray in the Spirit alone for his own edification.¹⁵⁰

In verse eighteen we discover that Paul speaks in tongues more than all of the Corinthians. He states, "Nevertheless, in church I would rather speak five words with my mind, in order to instruct others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue" (NRSV). This is clearly a continuation of his argument for proper consideration for others within the church. It has been noted that this statement is typical of Paul. Stendahl notes, "Paul claims he is the greatest in everything; the greatest sinner, hardest worker, suffered more, note in 1 Cor. 14:18 he speaks in tongues more than everyone."¹⁵¹ Regardless, it is imperative to note that his focus is not on tongues but on the manifestation of Spiritual gifts through love for the betterment of the assembly. This is his rebuke on the false teachings concerning glossolalia.

The next verses reveal a great deal about the translation of *glw`ssa* in Paul. In verse twenty-one he writes, "In the law it is written, 'By people of strange tongues and by the lips of foreigners I will speak to this people; yet even then they will not listen to me,' says the Lord" (NRSV).¹⁵² In this verse he uses the phrase *ejn eJteroglwvssoi*,¹⁵³ "in other tongues." It is evident from Paul's use of the word "other" in modifying tongues that if he wanted to distinguish his usage of tongues from that practiced by the Corinthians, he would.¹⁵⁴

Paul's admonition of the Corinthians regarding uninterpreted tongues concludes with verses twenty-two through twenty-five:

Tongues, then, are a sign not for believers but for unbelievers, while prophecy is not for unbelievers but for believers. If, therefore, the

¹⁴⁸ Barrett, *Corinthians*, 321 and Findlay, 908, note this is taken from Judaism in which the congregation offers its assent that what has been said is true.

¹⁴⁹ Johnson, "Tongues, Gift of," 600, contrast Barrett, *Corinthians*, 320.

¹⁵⁰ See Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 670 and Johnson, "Tongues, Gift of," 600.

¹⁵¹ Stendahl, 122.

¹⁵² This passage is taken directly from Isaiah 28:11-12.

¹⁵³ Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 679, points out that the LXX has *di;a glw;ssa~ eJtevrαι* for Isaiah 28:11, Paul instead writes *ejn eJteroglwvssoi*. Either Paul deliberately changed the wording from the LXX or *ejn eJteroglwvssoi* is his own rendering of the expression directly from the Hebrew.

¹⁵⁴ See Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit*, 243.

whole church comes together and all speak in tongues, and all speak in tongues, and outsiders or unbelievers enter, will they not say that you are out of your mind? But if all prophesy, an unbeliever or outsider who enters is reproved by all and called to account by all. After the secrets of the unbeliever's heart are disclosed, that person will bow down before God and worship him, declaring, "God is really among you" (NRSV).

It is clear from these verses that Paul views tongues as a gift to be exercised privately, not among the entire congregation. Dunn notes, "the exegesis becomes clearer if we assume that the passage is polemically directed against those in Corinth who regard speaking in tongues too highly."¹⁵⁵ He continues, "this faction have maintained that glossolalia is a sign for believers, that is, a proof of pneumatic status and authority."¹⁵⁶ However, Paul challenges this assumption using the "only relevant passage in the law which mentions unintelligible utterances (Isa. 28. 11-12)."¹⁵⁷ For tongues are a sign for unbelievers, but are not meant to be practiced within the church. Dunn concludes that the unintelligible utterances of glossolalia are not a sign for believers but for unbelievers. They are "a sign of divine judgment, not of divine pleasure," and, "a sign, that is, not of their closeness to God but their distance from God."¹⁵⁸ Fee concludes by writing, "Thus, tongues and prophecy function as 'signs' in two different ways, precisely in accord with the *effect* each will have on unbelievers who happen into the Christian assembly" (*italics his*).¹⁵⁹

Conclusions

It is very important for the modern interpreter of Paul to remember, as stated above, that he is a "contextual theologian." To read Paul differently is to misunderstand him. This bearing in mind, we may now formulate conclusions of Paul's theology of glossolalia in 1 Corinthians 12-14 from within its context of conflict.

Turner notes, "Paul is not critical of tongues per se—he practices them himself abundantly and is thankful for it and encourages it—what he is against and heavily criticizes is the domination of the assembly by uninterrupted tongues."¹⁶⁰ It is obvious that Paul deems all gifts viable for the common good and not for personal aggrandizement. Furthermore, the above exegesis suggests that Paul never ranks the gifts. All are viable in

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 230.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 230-31.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 231.

¹⁵⁹ Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 683.

¹⁶⁰ Turner, 20.

different ways. Tongues are listed last in 1 Cor. 12:8-10 and 27-28 not to diminish their importance but instead to contrast the role attributed to them as the most spiritual by the Corinthians. It is irrelevant whether Paul understood glossolalia as xenoglossolalia or possibly heavenly languages.¹⁶¹ The importance is that they were not understandable by either the listeners or the speakers. In response to two of the questions posed at the outset of this study, no, tongues are not given to every believer and should not be practiced until they are perfected.

We see from Paul that glossolalia is not “a sign of spiritual accomplishment, it is not the graduation with high honors into the category of the truly spiritual.”¹⁶² Although he views uninterpreted tongues as a noncommunicative phenomenon,¹⁶³ they still have a role in the Christian experience. The exegesis of 1 Corinthians 13:8-12 reveals that tongues are still a viable gift within the church today, and only with the Parousia will they become unnecessary. We see above that the primary function of tongues is to benefit the community of believers, therefore, uninterpreted tongues have limited benefits. Likewise, 14:6-10 reveals that the needs of others, especially non-believers should be held in higher esteem than one’s own desires to be “spiritual.” Following, Paul will pray/speak/sing in the vernacular for the sake of others, but will continue to do the same in the Spirit in his own personal prayer life. Although many Pentecostals have taken Paul out of context to support a variety of experiences within their contemporary churches, mainline Protestants have erred equally in the opposite direction in their rejection of all forms of glossolalia. Lastly, we must remember that glossolalia is not a sign for believers but for unbelievers. In other words, Paul’s admonitions in 1 Corinthians 12-14 indicate that tongues function as a sign only for unbelievers but should not dominate the assembly.

Other New Testament Texts

In our quest to ascertain the New Testament perspective of glossolalia, it is imperative that we examine every aspect which would inform the proper understanding. In the following texts the respective authors do not always discuss the topic of speaking in tongues. However, they do deal with critical issues that have a role to play in a correct understanding of the issue.

Contained within the “longer ending” of Mark’s Gospel, there is a saying of Jesus which states that believers will “speak in new tongues” (16:17).¹⁶⁴

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁶² Stendahl, 123.

¹⁶³ Johnson, “Tongues, Gift of,” 597.

¹⁶⁴ I am fully aware that the majority of New Testament scholars do not attribute Mark 16:9-20 to the original text. However, in most translations this pericope is in fact included in the text and therefore will be considered in ascertaining the New Testament perspective on glossolalia.

This statement will be examined in its context and exegeted in an attempt to extrapolate its purpose within the Gospel. John, in his Gospel, goes to great lengths to clarify the role of the Holy Spirit. Lastly, Paul's letter to the Romans also contains pertinent discussions of the Holy Spirit. Specifically in Romans chapter eight, he speaks of the role of the Holy Spirit in the lives of believers. Furthermore, Paul mentions "the groanings of the Spirit" in chapter eight verses twenty-two through twenty-seven. This passage is often used as a proof text by Pentecostals to justify a special "prayer language" in which the believer prays in tongues. This chapter will be closely examined and we will consider the viability of such a doctrine based on this passage of Scripture. These texts will assist in the clarification of the New Testament perspective on glossolalia. Lastly, it will be determined, based on these other passages, if a unified theology of tongues can be made, or if the reader will have to suffice with differing theological perspectives among the texts.

The Gospel of Mark

In comparison to other biblical writers Mark is very quiet about the role of the Holy Spirit. The word "Spirit" (*pneuma*) is used by Mark only twenty-three times.¹⁶⁵ Furthermore, the majority of these usages deal exclusively with demonic or unclean spirits and exorcism. It is obvious that Mark does not place a lot of emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit. Most likely this is a result of Mark's Judaistic background, which would be far less concerned with the *pneuma* than his Hellenistic contemporaries.¹⁶⁶

The longer ending of Mark (chapter sixteen, verses nine through twenty), presents a problem for acquiring a proper understanding of Mark's understanding of the Holy Spirit. The New International Version editors note that "the earliest manuscripts and some other ancient witness do not have Mark 16:9-20."¹⁶⁷ This presents an exegetical challenge for New Testament scholars. How much reliability should be attributed to such a pericope? Some scholars note that "it is impossible to date the text before the middle of the 2nd century."¹⁶⁸ Furthermore, the texts in question are attributed to the sayings of Jesus. What significance does this have on the issue at hand? In addition, since it is believed that both Matthew and Luke used portions of Mark's Gospel in the formulation of their own writings,

¹⁶⁵ Aland, 224-5.

¹⁶⁶ See Everett Ferguson, *Backgrounds of Early Christianity*, 2nd edition (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1993), 313, 503. Contrast the understanding of "Spirit" between the Greek and Jewish cultures.

¹⁶⁷ International Bible Society, *NIV* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1984), 934.

¹⁶⁸ Johnson, "Tongues, Gift of," 597.

¹⁶⁹ In Greek the phrase "they will speak in new tongues" is *glwvssai lalhvsousin kainai*. Johnson in "Tongues, Gift of," 597, notes that the "textual evidence of the adjective 'new'" is very weak.

why is this section not mentioned, given its significance? Such questions must be directed towards such a questionable text in the New Testament.

The passage of immediate importance to this study is Mark 16:15-18, which reads:

And he [Jesus] said to them, "Go into all the world and proclaim the good news to the whole creation. The one who believes and is baptized will be saved; but the one who does not believe will be condemned. And these signs will accompany those who believe: by using my name they will cast out demons; they will speak in new tongues;¹⁶⁹ they will pick up snakes in their hands, and if they drink any deadly thing, it will not hurt them; they will lay their hands on the sick, and they will recover" (NRSV).

It is important to note that the writer of this section is attempting to give a great deal of authority to these statements by attributing them to Jesus. The phrase *glwssai` lalhvsousin kainai`* is found within the context of other charismatic experiences (i.e. picking up snakes, drinking poison). Given this context, the author reveals the arena from which he/she is writing about glossolalia. It is therefore an illegitimate argument to use Mark 16:17 as a proof text for the necessity of glossolalia. Gramatically one can not separate the speaking in new tongues from the other charismatic experiences mentioned as well. Therefore, if one wishes to use the above pericope as a proof text for legitimizing initial evidence, then that person must also handle snakes and drink poison as well. The evidence clearly reveals that this was a later addition to the text and was more than likely not stated by Jesus.¹⁷⁰ Dunn argues that the longer ending of Mark was actually produced by the Lukan community in an attempt to legitimize tongues for it was "a typical sign of the gospel's expansion in the first century and perhaps also in the second."¹⁷¹

The Gospel of John

John's understanding of the Holy Spirit is far less questionable and exceedingly more abundant than that of Mark. This makes perfect sense given the fact that John's thought is deeply pervaded by Hellenism.¹⁷² John makes reference to the *pneuma* far more than Mark does. However, John shares with Mark the fact that neither use the word *glw`ssa* anywhere in their accounts.¹⁷³ It is clear that John has a specific understanding of the role

¹⁷⁰ Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (London: United Bible Societies, 1975), 122-8.

¹⁷¹ Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit*, 246.

¹⁷² See F. W. Horn, 261-2 for a better understanding of the Hellenistic usage of *pneuma*.

¹⁷³ Aland, 62-3.

of the Holy Spirit. The primary texts dealing with the function and role of the Holy Spirit are John 14:15-31, 15:26, and 16:5-16.

In John 14:15-31 we find Jesus at the Passover feast with his disciples. He has just washed his disciples' feet and predicted his betrayal and denial. Sensing their fear and frustration Jesus comforts his disciples and promises that he will send them the Holy Spirit to act as a comforter. Jesus says in John 14:16-17, "And I will ask the Father, and he will give you another Advocate,¹⁷⁴ to be with you forever. This is the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it neither sees him nor knows him. You know him, because he abides with you, and he will be in you" (NRSV). It is apparent from these verses that John understands the Holy Spirit as a comforter, or helper that will live within only believers. In verse twenty-six Jesus continues, "But the Advocate, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, will teach you everything, and remind you of all that I have said to you" (NRSV). Here one sees John's understanding of the Holy Spirit as a teacher as well as a helper.

In John 15:26, within the context of Jesus' revelation to his disciples that the world will hate them if they follow him, He also makes a note about the Holy Spirit. He notes, "When the Advocate comes, whom I will send to you from the Father, the Spirit of truth who comes from the Father, he will testify on my behalf" (NRSV). Here we see that John views the Holy Spirit as one who testifies on behalf of Christ in accordance with the truth. This is a continuation of the attributes of the Spirit and does not signify any contradiction of his previous statements.

In John 16:5-16 we read John's further explanation of the function and purpose of the Holy Spirit. In verse eight we read that He "will convict the world of guilt in regard to sin and righteousness and judgment" (NIV). Therefore, John views the role of the Holy Spirit as one who brings the conviction of sin as well as the attributes he has mentioned above. Jesus concludes his promises concerning the Holy Spirit in 16:13-15 by saying:

When the Spirit of truth comes, he will guide you into all the truth; for he will not speak on his own, but will speak whatever he hears, and he will declare to you the things that are to come. He will glorify me, because he will take what is mine and declare it to you. All that the Father has is mine. For this reason I said that he will take what is mine and declare it to you (NRSV).

John reiterates here that the Spirit is one who guides into truth. Furthermore, John depicts the Holy Spirit as one who glorifies Christ and declares Him to all believers.

Throughout the entire Gospel John never mentions speaking in tongues. Moreover, he does not even hint that tongues are the initial evidence of Spirit baptism. What we do find in John is a picture of the Holy Spirit as

¹⁷⁴ In Greek the word for "Advocate" is *paraklhvto~*, which is a masculine, singular accusative, noun which literally means, "called to one's aid."

one who comforts, teaches, convicts, and proclaims the good news about Jesus to all believers in the world. Finally, one should note that the Spirit is a promised possession for believers in John's Gospel (15:26). Furthermore, the absence of tongues in John's Gospel does much to undermine the Pentecostal position affirming that those who receive the Spirit should speak in tongues.

Romans

Lastly in this examination of other New Testament texts that have a bearing on the issue of glossolalia is Paul's Epistle to the Romans. In Romans we find no mention of the phenomenon of glossolalia. Furthermore, the picture that Paul paints of the role of the Spirit differs drastically from the understanding assumed by Pentecostals.

Chapter eight of Romans is the primary place within the entire Epistle in which Paul discusses the Spirit. Paul, like John, understands that if one is "in Christ Jesus" then the Spirit of God dwells in that person.¹⁷⁵ It is important to note the language used by Paul in speaking of the Holy Spirit. He speaks in verse 15 of "receiving"¹⁷⁶ the Holy Spirit. Furthermore, this is a phenomenon which occurs, in Paul's eyes, when one is saved. Moreover, Paul concurs with John in noting in Romans 8:16 that "the Spirit himself testifies with our spirit that we are God's children" (NIV). Notice the similar use by both Paul and John of the Spirit as one who testifies. This is very significant in our formulation of the New Testament understanding of glossolalia, which is, in essence, a New Testament understanding of the function of the Holy Spirit within believers.

Chapter eight presents an entirely new issue for discussion. Paul notes in verse twenty-two through twenty-seven:

We know that the whole creation has been groaning in labor pains until now;¹⁷⁷ and not only the creation, but we ourselves, who have the first fruits of the Spirit, groan inwardly while we wait for adoption, the redemption of our bodies. For in hope we were saved. Now hope that is seen is not hope. For who hopes for what is seen? But if we hope for what we do not see, we wait for it with patience.

Likewise the Spirit helps us in our weakness; for we do not know how to pray as we ought, but that very Spirit intercedes with sighs too deep for words. And God, who searches the heart, knows what is the mind of the Spirit, because the Spirit intercedes for the saints

¹⁷⁵ See Romans 8:9, 11, and 14.

¹⁷⁶ In Greek the phrase used to describe this receiving of the Spirit is *ejlavbete pneu`ma*.

¹⁷⁷ See James D. G. Dunn, "Romans 1-8," in *Word Biblical Commentary*, eds. David A. Hubbard and Glenn W. Barker, vol. 38a (Dallas: Word Books, Publisher, 1988), 472. Dunn comments that "groanings," *sustenavzw* in Gk. represents the metaphor of "birth pains" and that this verb falls within an eschatological context.

according to the will of God (NRSV).

This passage introduces an interesting perspective in dealing with the New Testament perspective of glossolalia. This is the primary text used to justify the Pentecostal doctrine of a "Prayer language."¹⁷⁸ We see that what Paul is actually writing to the Christians at the Church of Rome is that we cannot pray as we should. Therefore, the Holy Spirit intercedes for us and prays with "groans that words cannot express"¹⁷⁹ (NIV). Barrett notes, "it seems on the whole more probable that the point of communion between Spirit (-filled worshiper) and God is immediate and needs no spoken word."¹⁸⁰ Several points need to be raised at this juncture. First, it is important to note that Paul never refers to a special prayer language.¹⁸¹ Second, if these groanings are "inexpressible," as the text clearly states then how can one justify their verbal expression via tongues?¹⁸² Dunn notes, that the "groanings" represent our frustration of being subject to "both epochs," the current epoch from Paul's perspective and the eschatological reality embarking upon the believer.¹⁸³ He does not even conceive of this passage within the framework of glossolalia. The prayer, Dunn argues, "denotes the dependence of the creature on the creator for all good" not a special prayer language.¹⁸⁴ Third, the context here is a life through the Holy Spirit. How can this one sporadic reference to the groanings of the Holy Spirit, given its context justify an entire doctrine of praying in tongues? Finally, one must ask, if this was indeed that significant of a practice, that it should in fact be incorporated into Christian praxis, why is it only mentioned once in the entire New Testament? The questions posed above bring into question a substantiation of glossolalia via a prayer language based on the New Testament.

¹⁷⁸ Stendahl, 123. See also Brumback, 247 ff. for a very informative explanation of the distinction between the Pentecostal understanding of a special prayer language and "congregational tongues." See also J. Ramsey Michaels', discussion of devotional tongues in McGee, *Initial Evidence*, 211.

¹⁷⁹ In Greek this phrase is to; pneu`ma uJperentugcavnei stenagmoi` " ajlalhvtai", literally translated this means "the Spirit intercedes/prays with inexpressible groanings."

¹⁸⁰ C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1957), 168.

¹⁸¹ Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 227. Dunn comments in his thorough rendering of Paul's theology that in Romans 8:23 Paul is making reference to "the redemption of the body," not some mysterious prayer language. Compare R. P. Meye, "Spirituality," *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, eds. Gerald F. Hawthorne and Ralph P. Martin (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1993), 912 for the same rendering as Dunn offers.

¹⁸² W. B. Hunter, "Prayer," *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, eds. Gerald F. Hawthorne and Ralph P. Martin (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1993), 733. Hunter deems it best to speak of stenagmoi` " (with sighs, groans) in Rom. 8:26 as a "prayer activity of the Spirit." See also E. Kaseman, *Commentary on Romans* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1980), 239-41 for the same interpretation.

¹⁸³ Dunn, *Word*, 477.

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid.*

Observations

Based on a thorough reading of the other New Testament texts that inform one's understanding of glossolalia, several overarching observations may be made. First, based on these passages found in Mark, John and Romans it is clear that there is no legitimate basis to support the Pentecostal doctrine of glossolalia as initial evidence. While the text in Mark does speak about tongues specifically, its reliability is seriously questionable. Furthermore, given its context amongst other charismatic manifestations, the feasibility of supporting glossolalia exclusively is also seriously questionable. In the Gospel of John we find an extensive description of the person and function of the Holy Spirit within the life of the believer. However, nowhere does John speak of or imply that tongues are in any way connected to the work of the Holy Spirit. Finally, in Romans it is evident that Paul is describing a phenomenon that is ambiguous in nature. Therefore, it neither supports nor discredits the Pentecostal doctrine of tongues. Likewise, all that can be truly ascertained from Paul's writing is that the Holy Spirit is at work within the life of believers. One definite conclusion is that the single reference to "groanings" in Romans is not sufficient to suggest the formulation of a legitimate prayer language in tongues. These texts are quite illuminating and greatly inform the New Testament perspective on glossolalia.

Conclusion

Through this study we have examined a great deal of information related to the issue of glossolalia. The Pentecostal doctrine of tongues as initial evidence of Spirit baptism has been presented using sources that are representative of that perspective. Likewise, the counterargument to this doctrine has been presented by way of introducing equally adept scholars who disagree with the perspective. Moreover, the emergence of a compromise has been presented. Although the issue remains largely polarized, several significant scholars have attempted to formulate a middle ground on the issue of glossolalia.

Furthermore, through this study we have thoroughly examined the New Testament texts that pertain to tongues speaking. It has been noted that the book of Acts is the primary text used to support the Pentecostal doctrine of tongues as initial evidence of Spirit baptism. In addition, through the careful exegesis of the key passages in Acts it has been presented that tongues as initial evidence cannot be substantiated from a New Testament perspective. One can see from the above exegesis of the Pentecost event that because of the language used, the miracle is most probably one of hearing and not speech. Moreover, due to the textual variation, some degree of interpretation is feasible. The above exegesis has revealed that in both the

Jewish (Acts 2:38-39), and Samaritan (Acts 8:4-25) conversion experiences Luke reveals that all were in fact filled with the Holy Spirit and yet neither experience was manifested by speaking in tongues. Likewise, in the account of Saul's conversion/call experience (Acts 9:1-19) he received the Holy Spirit and yet did not speak in tongues. Conversely, tongues are recorded in Acts 10:46 and 19:6; however, in neither instance does Luke comment that they were languages heard by other hearers. Therefore, the argument that the same event which occurred at Pentecost was repeated exactly at Caesarea and Ephesus is not biblically grounded. Finally, in looking at Acts 21:40, 22:2, and 26:14, Luke's variance in using *dialekto~* rather than *glwvsai~* suggests that Luke views the former as actual languages and the latter as ecstatic speech. From the exegesis of Acts it is clear that tongues were practiced, that in some instances they did accompany the outpouring of the Spirit, yet this is far from conclusive in supporting the Pentecostal doctrine of tongues as initial evidence of Spirit baptism.

Special attention has also been given to Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians. The exegesis of these chapters, 12-14, has revealed that Paul was clearly not speaking to the issue of evidential tongues, but rather to the gift of tongues. Further, it is clear that whether Paul understood glossolalia as xenoglossolalia, heavenly languages or ecstatic utterances, his address is to the disorder produced by uninterpreted tongues in the assembly. In other words, Paul's definition of tongues is not as important as the fact that tongues at Corinth were not understandable by either the speaker nor the observers and needed regulation. It has been presented that Paul intended to reform the Corinthian understanding of tongues by maintaining love as the central motive and resuming order within the fellowship. Furthermore, it has been noted above that Paul did not wish for tongues to cease but to be held in their proper perspective. That perspective was resigned to the private life of the individual with God. Lastly, we have seen that while Pentecostals receive much of the blame for stretching the exegesis of 1 Corinthians in their favor, non-Pentecostals run the risk of doing the exact opposite in favor of their preconceived perspective. The only solution is a balanced perspective which accounts for the context from which Paul is writing, the nature of his argument, and the implications of his admonitions.

In the above study other New Testament texts that influence a proper understanding of glossolalia, have been presented to offer conclusive results. First, based on these passages found in Mark, John, and Romans, it is clear that there is no legitimate basis to support the Pentecostal doctrine of glossolalia as initial evidence. Second, given the questionable context of Mark 16:9-20, its reliability in the formulation of a New Testament understanding of glossolalia is dismissable. Third, the fact that John never says that tongues are in any way connected to the work of the Holy Spirit further discredits the Pentecostal argument. Finally, in Romans it is evident that Paul is describing a phenomenon that is ambiguous in nature; therefore, Romans 8 neither supports nor discredits the Pentecostal doctrine of

tongues. Likewise, all that can be truly ascertained from Romans is that the Holy Spirit is at work within the lives of believers. One definite conclusion is that the single reference to “groanings” in Romans is not sufficient to suggest the formulation of a legitimate prayer language in tongues. Moreover, their placement within the context of Paul’s eschatological framework subverts the Pentecostal claims. Now that we have recapitulated the textual evidence regarding the issue of glossolalia we may answer the question posed at the outset of this study.

An Answer to Primary Questions

The first question posed to begin this study was; what exactly are tongues? It is clear from the material presented that tongues are looked upon differently in both the New Testament and within contemporary circles. The exegesis of key passages in Acts suggests that Luke’s use of the word depicts undiscernable ecstatic utterances. Furthermore, Luke emphasizes this understanding of tongues in his juxtaposition between *glw`sa* and *dialektōn*, in which the latter clearly means actual spoken languages. Paul, on the other hand, is not as concerned with clarifying his use of *glw`ssa* as either xenoglossolalia, ecstatic utterances, or heavenly languages. Paul places his emphasis on the unintelligibility of uninterpreted tongues, and whatever they actually were (actual languages, etc.) is not crucial. He does not view the gift of tongues as unintelligible babbling, but as a spiritual gift which, when interpreted, can edify the church. Most modern Pentecostals who speak about tongues are referring to the chaotic babbling found in their Pentecostal churches today and hence look to 1 Corinthians for support.¹⁸⁵ Likewise, mainline Protestants, who are opposed to the phenomenon, look to 1 Corinthians to support only speaking in other actual languages.¹⁸⁶ However, if people comprehend what is being spoken then it is no longer foreign to the congregates and is not glossolalia. Yet, by the same token, if foreign languages are spoken and no one can understand them, they are still subject to Paul’s rebuke found in 12-14.

The second question posed at the outset of this study was whether tongues are good or bad? It seems clear that from a New Testament perspective there is nothing inherently wrong with tongues. The New Testament passages in question do, however, restrict the usage of tongues. Tongues are bad if they are practiced in a chaotic fashion by an entire assembly. Furthermore, they are bad if they are practiced without regard of whether an interpreter is present. Lastly, the New Testament reveals that tongues are bad if they are used to edify the believer alone and not to bring a word of prophecy to the assembly at large, for gifts find their proper function within the building up of the body of believers. Tongues can be

¹⁸⁵ See Conn, 23, Everts, 71, and Turner, 17.

¹⁸⁶ Johnson, “Tongues, Gift of,” 600.

viewed as good if used in an orderly manner with a proper interpretation or in private, as Paul attests (14:15).

The third question that prompted this study was, whether it was expected that every Christian should speak in tongues? The answer, which finds a unanimous answer in all of the texts explained above is “no.” The New Testament evidence contradicting this view is overwhelming. Consequently, no one who takes the New Testament seriously can espouse a view that all believers should practice glossolalia in any form. The Spirit clearly gives that gift to certain individuals and not to others as a sign for unbelievers and to edify the church.

The fourth topic, which required clarification from the above exegesis, was whether or not tongues should be practiced in order for one to “perfect” them? Once again, it appears that the correct answer is “no.” The New Testament texts do not allude to any such practice. In fact, this perspective runs contrary to Paul’s admonition that the Spirit gives the gifts as the Spirit chooses. By practicing speaking in tongues until one is “proficient” seems to be little more than the pursuit of self-aggrandizement, which is not the purpose of spiritual gifts.

Is it appropriate for Christians to practice tongues today? This was the last question seeking answers from a detailed study of the New Testament. The answer to this question is “yes.” Tongues are a viable spiritual gift that, when used correctly, can greatly enrich the experience of a congregation. However, the New Testament texts do reveal that the above mentioned usage should be stridently enforced in order to maintain propriety within the church.

A Critique of Pentecostalism

Now that we have arrived at a proper biblical perspective of glossolalia as evidenced in the New Testament, it is imperative that a critique of Pentecostalism be offered. As is the case with most denominations, various doctrines loosely supported become much more rigid over time,¹⁸⁷ and eventually become a definitive trademark of the group. Likewise, within Pentecostalism their understanding of glossolalia has become dogmatized over the years.¹⁸⁸ Unfortunately, this doctrine has now become so intertwined with Pentecostal theology that it is no longer substantiated properly via the Bible but by history. Therefore, based on our New Testament perspective of glossolalia a critique of Pentecostal theology is in order.

The first critique is in the area of semantics. Pentecostals continuously

¹⁸⁷ Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, 4.

¹⁸⁸ *Ibid.*

use the language of being “baptized in the Holy Spirit.”¹⁸⁹ However, in the entire New Testament the phrase is used only twice.¹⁹⁰ Conversely, the New Testament writers frequently use the phrase “filled with the Holy Spirit.” It is used eight different times in eight verses.¹⁹¹ Therefore, Pentecostals should use the language of the New Testament when speaking about a supposed New Testament perspective.

Another critique of Pentecostalism is in regards to their connotation of baptism in the Holy Spirit. In general, Pentecostals are referring to an additional event that is altogether separate from the regeneration that occurs at conversion. Pentecostals view the baptism of the Holy Spirit as an additional experience, which is designed to equip the believer with “power for service.”¹⁹² This is a great theory; however, it cannot be substantiated by the biblical text. In all Pentecostal exegesis they refer to the same texts that have constituted this study.¹⁹³ Yet, rather than attempting to legitimize a New Testament perspective on being filled with the Holy Spirit (i.e. regeneration at conversion), they improperly try to legitimize their own doctrine of the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Following this line of reasoning Dunn notes that, while the “dynamic and experiential nature of Spirit-baptism is well founded,” the separation of it from “conversion-initiation is wholly unjustified.”¹⁹⁴ If Pentecostals wish to use critical methods of New Testament exegesis then they must analyze the text for what it is saying, and not misconstrue phrases to deduce what they wish. In short, the Pentecostals can only legitimately begin to argue that glossolalia is the initial evidence of being filled with the Holy Spirit; however, as the above exegesis has proven, this is exegetically indefensible.

One final critique is in order. Based on the research conducted thus far, it is imperative that if Pentecostals wish to maintain their biblical grounding they must foster a proper perspective on the issue. The Apostle Paul makes it abundantly clear that tongues should only be conducted in an orderly fashion within the assembly, with an interpreter present. Furthermore, the New Testament offers no explicit basis for the Pentecostal argument for a special prayer language. Even though these findings contradict the ways in

¹⁸⁹ See McGee, *Initial Evidence*, 119-30 for some popular exposition of initial evidence within Pentecostalism in which the above phrase is used exclusively.

¹⁹⁰ The two occurrences are found only in the 1901 American Standard Bible translation of Acts 1:5 and 11:16.

¹⁹¹ In the NIV the phrase is found in Luke 1:15, 41, 67; Acts 2:4, 4:8, 4:31, 9:17, and 13:9.

¹⁹² McGee, *Initial Evidence*, 120. See also R. A. Torrey, *What the Bible Teaches* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1933), pp. 271-73. Quoted by Charles W. Conn, “Glossolalia and the Scriptures,” *The Glossolalia Phenomenon*, ed. Wade H. Horton (Cleveland, TN: Pathway Press, 1966), 33-34. Torrey refers to this as an “impartation of power.”

¹⁹³ See McGee, *Initial Evidence*, 202-18, Brumback, 261, Conn, 24 ff. etc. *Scrisolalia Phenomenon*, ed. Wade H. Horton (Cleveland, TN: Pathway Press, 196), 33-3

¹⁹⁴ Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, 4

which Pentecostals have historically practiced glossolalia, they must be heeded if Pentecostals wish to be a biblically sound denomination.

A Critique of Mainline Protestantism

In all fairness to the above exegesis, a critique of those opposed to the Pentecostal perspective is also in order. The tendency of most New Testament exegetes is to interpret texts from a particular perspective. While this cannot be totally prevented, the inclination to do so must be noticed and hence should be weighed into one's final analysis. It appears that a large number of mainline Protestants have reacted to tongues in a very negative way, and, consequently, their conclusions have forced the exegesis in the opposite direction. In so doing, they are in effect behaving exactly the same as some Pentecostal exegetes—that is manipulating the biblical evidence to highlight their position.

The first critique offered to non-Pentecostal scholars who deal with the issue of glossolalia is their overwhelming insistence that the tongues practiced by Paul (1 Cor. 14:18) were somehow different from those practiced by the Corinthians. Some have gone to great lengths to argue that Paul simply spoke in other languages;¹⁹⁵ however, this is an unfeasible perspective given the New Testament evidence. Such a conclusion clearly cannot be deduced from the pertinent New Testament texts.

One final critique is in order. This second critique, which may be offered to those opposed to the Pentecostal perspective is their insistence that tongues are no longer viable for the church today. Some argue that tongues ended either with the Apostolic Age or the canonization of Scripture.¹⁹⁶ However, exegetically the interpreter from such a perspective simply has to infer far too much in order to conceive of such a rendering. Moreover, those who conclude in such a fashion must ignore textual clues which suggest that Paul is referring to the Parousia in 1 Corinthians 13:8-12. The above resolution by some mainline Protestant scholars clearly indicts them of erring in the opposite direction of the Pentecostals who manipulate Scripture. Such a maneuvering of the New Testament evidence is simply unacceptable.

¹⁹⁵ See for instance, Turner, 20, Valencourt, 20, and Johnson, "Tongues, Gift of," 597 not to mention a plethora of more fundamentalist perspectives not even regarded in this study.

¹⁹⁶ Johnson, "Glossolalia and the Embarrassments of Experience," 125, and Horton, 214. See also Turner's list, 39.

Works Cited

- Aland, Kurt. *Vollständige Konkordanz Zum Griechischen Neuen Testament*. Vol. 2. Spezialübersichten, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1978.
- Balz, Horst and Gerhard Schneider, eds. *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*. Vol. 1. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1990.
- Barclay, William. *The Letters to the Corinthians*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1975.
- Barrett, C. K. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1957.
- _____. *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1968.
- Bauer, W. "Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur." *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Translated and Edited by W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich. Chicago: University Press, 1957.
- Brumback, Carl. *What Meaneth This?* Springfield, MO, 1947.
- Conn, Charles W. "Glossolalia and the Scriptures." Edited by Wade H. Horton, *The Glossolalia Phenomenon*. Cleveland, TN: Pathway Press, 1966.
- Dunn, James D. G. *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1970.
- _____. *Jesus and the Spirit*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1975.
- _____. "Romans 1-8." in *Word Biblical Commentary*. eds. David A. Hubbard and Glenn W. Barker. Vol. 38a. Dallas: Word Books, Publisher, 1988.
- _____. *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998.
- Engelbrech, Edward. "To Speak in a Tongue." *Concordia Journal* 22 (July 1996): 295-302.
- Everts, Jenny. "Tongues or languages." *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 4 (April 1994): 71-80.
- Fee, G. D. "Gifts of the Spirit." *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*. Edited by Gerald F. Hawthorne and Ralph P. Martin. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1993.
- _____. "Hermeneutics and Historical Precedent: A Major Problem in Pentecostal Hermeneutics." *Perspectives on the New Pentecostalism*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1976.
- _____. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1987.
- Ferguson, Everett. *Backgrounds of Early Christianity*. 2nd Edition. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1993.

Findlay, G. G. "St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians." in *The Expositor's Greek Testament*. Edited by W. Robertson Nicoll. Vol. 2. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, no date given.

Hafemann, S. J. "Corinthians, Letters to the." *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*. Edited by Gerald F. Hawthorne and Ralph P. Martin. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1993.

Horn, F. W. "Holy Spirit." *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. Vol. 6. New York: Bantam Doubleday Dell Publishing Group, Inc., 1992.

Hunter, W. B. "Prayer." *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*. Edited by Gerald F. Hawthorne and Ralph P. Martin. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1993.
International Bible Society. *NIV*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1984.

Johnson, Luke Timothy. "Glossolalia and the Embarrassments of Experience." *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 2 (1997): 113-34.

_____. "Tongues, Gift of." *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. Vol. 6. New York: Bantam Doubleday Dell Publishing Group, Inc., 1992.
Kaseman, E. *Commentary on Romans*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1980.

Kulathungam, Lyman. "Why Tongues?" *Eastern Journal of Practical Theology* 6 (1992): 22-37.

Liddell, H. G. and R. Scott, eds. "glw' ssa." *Greek-English Lexicon: With a Revised Supplement*, 9th ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

Louw, Johannes P. and Eugene A. Nida, eds. "glw' ssa." Vol. 1. *The Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains*. New York: United Bible Societies, 1989.

Macchia, Frank D. "Discerning the Spirit in Life: A review of God the Spirit by Michael Welker." *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 10 (April 1997): 3-28.

_____. "The Question of Tongues as Initial Evidence." *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 2 (April 1993): 117-27

McGee, Gary B. "Early Pentecostal Hermeneutics: Tongues as Evidence in the Book of Acts." Edited by Gary B. McGee. *Initial Evidence*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1991.

Menzies, William W. and Robert P. *Spirit and Power: Foundations of Pentecostal Experience*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 2000.

Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. London: United Bible Societies, 1975.

Meye, R. P. "Spirituality." *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*. Edited by Gerald F. Hawthorne and Ralph P. Martin. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1993.

Roebeck, C.M. Jr. "Tongues." *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*. Edited by Gerald F. Hawthorne and Ralph P. Martin. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1993.

Samarin, William J. *Tongues of Men and Angels: The Religious Language of Pentecostalism*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1972.

Stendahl, K. "Glossolalia and the Charismatic Movement." *God's Christ and His People*. Edited by J. Jervell and W. Meeks. Oslo: Universitets forlaget, 1977.

Stronstad, Roger. "The Prophethood of All Believers: A Study in Luke's Charismatic Theology." *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 16 (1999): 1-45.

Thayer, Joseph Henry. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1889.

Turner, Max. "Spiritual Gifts: Then and Now." *Vox Evangelica* 15 (1985): 7-64.

Valencourt, Roy J. "Paul's Perspective on Glossolalia." *A.M.E. Zion Quarterly Review* 105 (April 1993): 18-26.

Willis, Lewis J. "Glossolalia in Perspective." *The Glossolalia Phenomenon*. Edited by Wade H. Horton. Cleveland, TN: Pathway Press, 1966.

Young, Amos. "Tongues on Fire in the Pentecostal Imaginations." *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 12 (April 1998): 39-65.

Zerhusen, Bob. "The Problem Tongues in 1 Cor. 14." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 27 (Winter 1997): 139-52.

JESUS' BAPTISMAL MOTIVATION

MICHAEL STONE

Introduction

The account of Jesus' baptism is present in every Synoptic gospel and precedes the beginning of His ministry. Nonetheless, the baptism of Jesus is often interpreted in light of the Pauline epistles and Acts, with little attention paid to his own motives. These motives, however, are essential to comprehend Jesus' understanding of his own ministry. Several questions are raised concerning the motives of Jesus in light of the baptismal narratives in the Gospels. The Gospels clearly assert that John's baptism was one of repentance, to which Jesus submitted. Why would a sinless Jesus submit to a baptism of repentance? There is also the issue of Jesus, the greater one, submitting to the baptism of John, the lesser one. Was Jesus ever a disciple of John? Did Jesus ever conduct a ministry parallel and in competition with that of John's? Despite the use of messianic terms, did John ever fully comprehend the nature of Jesus' messianic calling and mission? Did Jesus? While modern research explores questions such as these, a cogent hypothesis is lacking: how would Jesus have understood his baptism and what are the implications of this understanding for comprehending the act of baptism?

This paper presumes a Jesus with fully human faculties.¹⁹⁷ Emphasizing this humanity results in a different portrait of Jesus from tradition: he was not omniscient or omnipotent, but rather gave these up, assuming the limitations of humanity. As a result, Jesus learned about his mission throughout his ministry and seemed to appreciate his identity as God

¹⁹⁷ Mt. 9:4, 12:25; Lk. 6:8, 9:47, 11:17; Jn. 6:64, 13:11 all describe miraculous "knowing" by Jesus. While not exhaustive, these passages represent a counter argument which suggests that Jesus did in fact use the power of his divine nature, at least on occasion. The opinion of this writer is that such powers are either the result of a politically sensitive Jesus or the result of Jesus' rather unique relationship to God.

incarnate through a process. Much biblical scholarship represents Jesus as superhuman, a Jesus who was not human. Against tradition and the bulk of biblical scholarship, this paper presumes that Jesus may not have known what to expect at his baptism and that his motives were real, in the sense that his actions were not taken merely to set a precedent. Balancing the two natures of Jesus, human and divine, has been a controversial struggle since the foundation of the church. This writer hopes to achieve a more cogent and realistic balance by examining a Jesus complete with human limitations, as Scripture¹⁹⁸ and tradition both assert. While affirming the full divinity of Jesus, I also maintain that the divine nature submitted to the limitations of humanity. Current scholarship has explained the imagery of the baptismal narratives, the background of John and his baptism, and even submitted hypotheses concerning Jesus' understandings of baptism. However, none have argued from the vantage point of a fully human Jesus with the explicit attempt to identify the likely motives for his baptism and the implications of such for the church at large. Nonetheless, this writer will carefully examine the roots of Jesus' baptism and the symbolism of its events in order to attempt to identify the motives of Jesus for his baptism.

I will begin by exploring the background of John the Baptist's baptismal ministry. Jesus clearly submitted to John's baptism, making discovery of John's baptismal roots essential. An in-depth analysis of John's possible precursors will follow, including Levitical ablutions, the rites of the Essenes, and Jewish proselyte baptism. Exegesis of John's preaching in the gospels and an exegesis of the relevant Old Testament scriptures and other Ancient Near Eastern texts that are echoed in John's messages will also be attempted. Such analysis will result in the identification of John's own understanding of his baptism, to which Jesus submitted.

I will then focus upon the baptismal narratives concerning Jesus specifically. Exegesis will emphasize the accounts within the synoptic gospels of Jesus' baptism, but also will take into account the references of Jesus to baptism made throughout the gospels. A careful word study of the most ancient Greek manuscripts in order to arrive at a proper understanding of the gospels' imagery will be included. An analysis of Jesus as a possible disciple of John will be conducted, as will the possibility of Jesus conducting a ministry contemporary, and even in competition, with John's own. The paper will explore the baptismal signs, including the dove, voice, and opening of heaven, based upon Old Testament theology and Scripture and Ancient Near Eastern Texts, such as the Dead Sea Scrolls, Mishnah, Talmud, and the Targumim. Such analysis will result in an identification of Jesus' own understanding of John's ministry and the ways in which he sought to continue and refine it.

¹⁹⁸ Passages such as Phil. 2 and Heb. 2:9-18 are but two examples. The pericopes of Jesus' temptation, found in Mk. 1:12-14 and parallels, are also cogent illustrations of Jesus' submission to human limits and emotions, despite his divinity.

Finally, in light of the above research, I will draw conclusions about Jesus' baptismal motivations and what possible interpretations may result. The goal of this paper is to produce an in-depth and more appropriate understanding of Jesus' baptismal motivations and their subsequent effect on the modern church.

Baptism of John **John's Baptismal Roots** **Essene**

The link between John and the Essenes has become widely disputed in recent scholarship. Some modern scholars have attempted to identify John's baptism and preaching with the Essenes and have suggested that John was himself an Essene who later broke away to form his own ministry. At the same time, other scholars refute this possibility based upon glaring differences in John's practice of baptism and preaching. The possibility of John's connections with the Essenes must be explored in detail in order to establish a context for John's personal baptismal understanding.

The Essenes of Qumran entered the desert in isolation in order to make and prepare for a new covenant with God, believing that mainline Judaism was failing in purity and obedience to the covenant. They hoped to form a community of radical obedience in preparation for the advent of God's new kingdom.¹⁹⁹ Indeed, the Essenes were merely one of several trans-Jordan sects that emerged from the Hassidic movement, which was based upon the eschatological hope for inner and outer purity.²⁰⁰ This understanding of purification and covenant as intimately related to the desert is characteristic of the Hebrew Bible: it was in the desert that God created Israel as a nation and formed the initial covenant. John's own understanding may reflect this movement for purity and the desire to establish a new community and covenant in the trans-Jordan desert. Yet such motives cannot prove any link between John and the Essenes. Nor can the emphasis of the Essenes on the importance of lustrations. During the Second Temple Period, immersion baths for removing ritual impurity were emphasized by many sects.²⁰¹ These sects included the Pharisees, especially in consideration of eating, and radical charismatics such as Bannus, the ascetic teacher of Josephus.²⁰²

Several other strong links seem to exist between John and the Essenes. John's message was of a similar eschatological nature to that found among the Essenes. Both asserted that the end was near and that drastic repentance

¹⁹⁹ G. R. Beasley-Murray, *Baptism in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986) 13.

²⁰⁰ Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 11-12.

²⁰¹ Joan E. Taylor, "John the Baptist and the Essenes," *Journal of Jewish Studies*, 47 (Autumn 1996) 260.

²⁰² Adela Yarbro Collins, "The Origin of Christian Baptism," *Studia Liturgica*, 19 (1989) 1: 28.36.

accompanied by lustrations apart from the temple were necessary for those who would be the new remnant, members in the new kingdom and covenant of God.²⁰³ Both also appear to have required visible repentance before lustration.²⁰⁴ In Essenic thought, the temple had been defiled by impurity, making good works the substitute for animal sacrifice. The lustrations were concerned with both inner atonement and outer purity. For both Qumran and John, the practice of righteousness and repentance made the bodily cleansing of baptism effective. As a result, both emphasized repentance as a prerequisite for baptism.²⁰⁵ This stood in contrast to the traditional Jewish understanding of outer purity as paramount. The traditional understanding would be criticized by both the preaching of John and Jesus and was certainly an Essenic criticism.²⁰⁶ Josephus, in *Antiquities* 18, echoed this understanding of baptism, that proper behavior was a prerequisite to lustration.²⁰⁷ Both John and the Essenes, therefore, refused immediate acceptance, scrutinizing potential candidates for baptism and emphasizing individual purity and repentance.

These links, however, are complicated for a variety of reasons. The nature of John's baptism was drastically different from that of Qumran. While Qumran mandated three lustrations per day, John's baptism was once and for all.²⁰⁸ Indeed, there is no evidence of John prescribing daily ritual immersions, though such would have been consistent with both mainline Judaism and the requirements of the Torah.²⁰⁹ In this sense, John's baptism represented something unique, both in relation to the Essenes and in relation to mainstream Judaism. Though John's baptism did not mark initiation into a physical community, the lustration of a novice at Qumran identified that person as a member of the community: Essenic lustrations had a deeply initiatory aspect.²¹⁰ John's baptism was also all encompassing, in contrast to mainline Judaism and Essenic practices of submitting to lustrations for particular sins.²¹¹ John is also distanced from Essenic practice by his radical asceticism, evidenced by his diet and dress, and the location and possible itinerancy of his ministry.²¹² Paul Hollenbach submits that John was itinerant, at least at the beginning of his ministry, visiting population centers and calling them to be baptized.²¹³ Furthermore, the lustrations of the Essenes were conducted by priests, albeit renegade sectarian ones, while

²⁰³ Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 18.

²⁰⁴ Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 17.

²⁰⁵ Taylor, *JJS*, 277-279.

²⁰⁶ Taylor, *JJS*, 280.

²⁰⁷ Collins, *SL*, 28.

²⁰⁸ Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 15.

²⁰⁹ Taylor, *JJS*, 263.

²¹⁰ Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 15-17.

²¹¹ Taylor, *JJS*, 282.

²¹² Taylor, *JJS*, 282.

²¹³ Paul W. Hollenbach, "John the Baptist," in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, 3 (New York: Doubleday, 1992) 894.

John was a charismatic prophet. In addition, the Essenes were an exclusive community while John's ministry and baptism were publicly held. Perhaps what is most unique about John's baptism in comparison with the Essenes and proselyte baptism was that John performed his baptism; the others were self-initiated.²¹⁴ The links between John and the Essenes appear quite weak. While both had a similar character to their preaching and emphasized ritual washings, John's immersions appear to have been unique for the time. Additionally, John's eschatological preaching required immediate social reform while the Essenes were separatists. John's asceticism and possible itinerancy also serve to divide the two. Therefore, while John may have been aware of the Essenes and their community at Qumran, to presume that he was an Essene or that he was heavily influenced by the Essenes seems inappropriate. Indeed, even if he had any sort of ties with the Essenes, which seems quite unlikely, John's ministry would reflect a large-scale reinterpretation of such views, resulting in a baptism and eschatology with a radically different character from that of the Essenes. Other sources must be examined as possible precursors to John's baptismal ministry.

Jewish Proselyte Baptism

Clear references to the practice of Jewish proselyte baptism are lacking until the second half of the first century, emerging at approximately 65 C.E.²¹⁵ Widespread controversy exists among scholars as to the exact date or even period in which Jewish proselyte baptism began to be practiced. The Hebrew word can describe either an initiatory bath or a ritual bath. Dating the emergence of the former is uncertain.²¹⁶

Scholars have observed the influence of Jewish proselyte baptism upon John's ministry. Alon suggested that proselyte baptism began as a ritual in the Second Temple Period to remove the Gentile uncleanness caused by idols, though Collins demonstrated that these ablutions were from contact and not necessarily initiatory.²¹⁷ Jeremias held a similar view, as extrapolated from Judith 14:10. Nonetheless, Jeremias argued for the presence of proselyte baptism in the early first century as a mode for purifying Gentile men and women from the uncleanness of menstruation. Jeremias supported his argument by the Testament of Levi's call in 14:6 to "purify the Gentile's wife." Yet Collins casts doubt upon Jeremias' position by noting the uncertain date and origin of the Twelve Patriarchs, the emphasis upon only circumcision for conversion in the Maccabean Period, the lack of treatment received by proselyte baptism in both Philo and Josephus, and the lack of clarity in rabbinic materials.²¹⁸ Schiffman, though

²¹⁴ Collins, *SL*, 32.

²¹⁵ Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 20-22.

²¹⁶ Collins, *SL*, 32.

²¹⁷ Collins, *SL*, 33-34.

²¹⁸ Collins, *SL*, 33-34.

unsure of the date of implementation for proselyte baptism before Yavneh, asserts proselyte baptism as necessary in order to understand John's. Obviously, this reasoning is flawed.²¹⁹

Some modern scholars have defended the traditional support of proselyte baptism's early origins and influence upon John. Arland Hultgren agrees with Schiffman, arguing that John reinterpreted Jewish proselyte baptism, which he claims existed in the first century of the Common Era as evidenced by the debate between the Hillel and Shammai schools as recorded in the Mishnah.²²⁰ The Hillelite School interpreted the recipient of ablutions as vicariously experiencing the formation of Israel, both through the Reed Sea and the covenant acceptance ceremony at Sinai.²²¹ Yet this debate cannot be dated with certainty either. Despite a lack of clear references Beasley-Murray argues that, while not directly influential upon John, Jewish proselyte baptism existed for the conversion of women throughout the first century.²²²

The preponderance of modern scholarship questions the date and influence of proselyte baptism. Buchler approximates the date of proselyte baptism's origin in mainline Judaism as 65 C.E. This is based upon eighteen decrees of purity, one of which declared Gentiles as intrinsically unclean. The Scobic, rabbinic texts of immersion also support a date towards the end of the first century C.E. Buchler also argues that proselyte baptism became essential for female converts, but only after the destruction of the temple in 70 C.E.²²³ The Tanak itself is without reference to the ablutions. One of the only certain references to proselyte baptism comes from Yebamoth 46a, though this text only asserts that it had begun as a practice and not that it was widespread in practice. Since this text originated in the late first century or early second century C.E., a late date for proselyte baptism is supported.²²⁴ The other certain reference comes from Epictetus' argument for initiatory baptism, though this was also from the late first century.²²⁵

The bulk of scholarship, therefore, seems to place John's baptism at least thirty years before Jewish proselyte baptism came into widespread practice.²²⁶ Even if proselyte baptism pre-dated the baptism of John, John clearly reinterpreted the act, calling Israel to repent of their impurity and

²¹⁹ Collins, *SL*, 33.

²²⁰ Arland J. Hultgren, "Baptism in the New Testament: Origins, Formulas, and Metaphors," *Word and World*, 14 (Winter 1994) 1: 8.

²²¹ Richard T. France, *Jesus of Nazareth: Lord and Christ*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994) 99.

²²² Beasley-Murray, *Baptism*, 22-31.

²²³ Collins, *SL*, 33.

²²⁴ Collins, *SL*, 34.

²²⁵ Collins, *SL*, 35.

²²⁶ Alan R. Culpepper, "The Gospel of Luke," in *The New Interpreter's Bible*, Nashville: Abingdon, 1995) 9: 81.

sinfulness that approximated that of the Gentiles.²²⁷ Indeed, proselyte baptism was not once and for all, but the first of many purifying ablutions.²²⁸ John's ministry must, therefore, be understood as the derivative of other sources.

Levitical Ablutions and Prophecy

The Gospel of Luke records John's descent from a priestly family. He would, therefore, have been familiar with the ablutions necessary to restore purification to the Jews, but especially to the priests.²²⁹ Such ablutions were necessary due to the defilement suffered by nocturnal emissions; the menstrual cycle; sexual intercourse; contact with a corpse, whether animal or human; or contact with any who had not been cleansed from contact with these.²³⁰ John's baptism may therefore be seen as the fulfillment of the Levitical requirements for purification.²³¹ Yet John's baptism was not for forgiveness, as Josephus attests in *Antiquities* 18:5.2, but for consecration. Righteousness, not baptism, would earn one forgiveness.²³² These washings were, therefore, in no way magical to the Jews, but rather for cleansing. Nor were these washings sacramental, outward signs of inward realities, as Jewish thought failed to separate the two states.²³³

The prophetic tradition is also concerned with various washings. Is. 1:16-17 and Ezek. 36:25-28 discuss a washing that is both physical and eschatological. In expectation of judgment, God would make a new heart, a new center of the will. This is the essence of John's emphasis upon necessary repentance.²³⁴ Texts such as Ps. 51:7, Is. 4:4, Jer. 4:14, and Zech. 13:1 also appear to be sources of John's eschatological and moral understandings for his baptism.²³⁵ The eschatological hope of the prophets was that a fountain would be opened to cleanse the house of David, even all of Israel. John would have shared this hope and Jesus revealed it as his as well by censuring the Pharisees for their failure to internalize the cleansing.²³⁶

²²⁷ Collins, *SL*, 32.

²²⁸ Stephen J. Pfann, *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*, (Boston: Brill, 1999) 337.

²²⁹ Collins, *SL*, 35.

²³⁰ Stephen Ricks, "Miqvaot: Ritual Immersion Baths in the Second Temple (Intertestamental) Jewish History," *BYU Studies*, 36 (1996-1997) 3: 279. Cf. Deut. 23:10-11; Lev. 12:2, 15:9, 15:16-18; Num. 5:2-3.

²³¹ Culpepper, *NIBGL*, 81.

²³² Hollenbach, *ABD*, 887.

²³³ Beasley-Murray, *BNT*, 6.

²³⁴ Collins, *SL*, 35.

²³⁵ John E. Phelan, Jr., "Baptism in the New Testament," *The Covenant Quarterly*, (November 1995- February 1996), 19.

²³⁶ Beasley-Murray, *BNT*, 7.

John's strongest sources for ministry would be Levitical washings and prophetic eschatological hopes. While his ministry would adapt the understandings of the Levites, it would show remarkable continuity with the prophets. Such continuity will be further explored in an analysis of John's preaching. The prophets and, to a lesser extent, the Levitical washings of purity are the greatest sources influencing John's ministry, not the Essenes or proselyte baptisms.

Pagan and Jewish Understandings of Water

Consideration of possible secular influences upon John is also important. Nock asserts that associations with pagan or Hellenistic initiation are impossible as they originated in the second century of the Common Era.²³⁷ Nonetheless, pagan lustrations were in practice long before John. In pagan understandings, the deity was thought to be present in the waters, communicating its presence to the persons or objects immersed.²³⁸

Lustrations possessed grave danger for potential possession by the demonic, especially at times of weakness, such as birth or sickness. Conversely, since health was associated with spirits, such lustrations also had the potential to heal and cleanse as the waters of lustration were linked with the blood of the deity in question: they would provide the necessary life forces for healing. Danger also existed in the possibility of being overwhelmed by the deity, of receiving too much. Pagan lustrations were, therefore, grave ceremonies, widely revered and feared for their potential powers.²³⁹ Those who dared to be immersed in the chaos of waters would find a rebirth, a possible restoration of youth and health, a dissolution of old forms.²⁴⁰ Despite chaotic connotations, water was also seen as precious, especially in the arid environment of Palestine. The people of Judah assumed and hoped that the messiah would bring water in abundance, that it would flow from the Temple as consistent with Ezekiel's vision.²⁴¹ Fear and awe, therefore, characterized the common understanding in the Ancient Near East of washings, by a presumption of supernatural elements at work in

²³⁷ Hultgren, *WW*, 7.

²³⁸ Such an understanding also lies behind the Lutheran and Catholic sacramental view of baptism: the waters convey the very presence of heaven. Martin Luther, "This is My Son, the Beloved: Sermon on the Baptism of Jesus," *Word and World*, (Winter 1996) 16:10. Ephrem would also echo such an understanding, suggesting that Christ deposited a robe of glory in the baptismal waters to restore Adam. Kilian McDonnell, "Jesus' Baptism in the Jordan," *Theological Studies*, (June 1995) 56: 2: 234.

²³⁹ Beasley-Murray, *BNT*, 2-6

²⁴⁰ Maura Campbell, "Symbol and Reality: Water, Life, Death, and Christian Baptism," *Dialogue and Alliance*, 4 (Spring 1990) 1: 50-51.

²⁴¹ Campbell, *DA*, 53.

the waters. The Jews themselves would have adopted some of this awe and fear of the waters, making John's baptism all the more grave. While pagan sources are not the origin for John's ministry, it is helpful to consider the gravity these beliefs and opinions bestowed on John's ministry.

John in Scripture

The Person

The Gospel writers had strong sentiments concerning John, many of which are based upon prophetic reinterpretation. Mk. 1:2-3 describes the basis for John's mission, at least in the eyes of Mark. Taken from the texts of Mal. 3:1, Ex. 23:20, and Is. 40:5, the quotation in Mark evokes three separate contexts that would describe the ministry of John. The Malachi text suggests the coming of a messenger, perhaps Elijah, who would precede the terrifying and awesome coming of God Himself. John also fits the Malachi description of the messenger in that he was insignificant except for his warning. The Exodus passage refers to the angel who prepared the way for Israel in the desert. In this sense, the messenger would prepare the new Israel for the dreadful coming of God. This passage also suggests the symbolical importance of the desert for the Jews. The third text, in Isaiah, predicts the salvation of Israel in relation to the desert.²⁴² Is. 40:3, found in Mt. 3:3, refers once again to the salvation that would come from the desert. This verse had already been understood eschatologically as groups such as the Essenes had already gone "into the wilderness."²⁴³ Not only the Isaiah text, but the lives and ministries of David, Moses, and Elijah also allude to the idea that salvation comes from the wilderness.²⁴⁴ Jesus himself would identify John as "more than a prophet," defining John as the Elijah figure of popular expectation and the witness attested to in the above passages.²⁴⁵ Indeed, John would be the turning point of God's method of revelation. He would be the final and greatest prophet. Jesus described him, in contrast to a vacillating reed, as firm; in contrast to the rich man, dressed as a nomad, a charismatic prophet; and as the final and greatest prophet.²⁴⁶ Still more, Jesus affirmed John as God's agent by submitting to his baptism. This action also shows that Jesus affirmed and expected John's eschatology.²⁴⁷ There is, after Mk. 11:30 and parallels, no question that John's baptismal

²⁴² Paul J. Sanky, "Promise and Fulfilment: Reader Response to Mark 1:1-15," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, 58 (June 1995), 7-9

²⁴³ Eugene M. Boring, "The Gospel of Matthew," in *The New Interpreter's Bible*, (Nashville: Abingdon, 1995) 8: 156.

²⁴⁴ Phema Perkins, "The Gospel of Mark," in *The New Interpreter's Bible*, (Abingdon: Nashville, 1995) 8: 530.

²⁴⁵ Lk. 1:17, 76, 3:4

²⁴⁶ Mt. 13:7-11.

²⁴⁷ Collins, *SL*, 36.

ministry was understood as heaven sent, both by Jesus and the Gospel writers.²⁴⁸ He would be the messenger of Malachi, Exodus, and Isaiah, preparing the way for the action of God.

The Preaching

John obviously regarded his baptism as incomplete: one would follow who would baptize with the Spirit.²⁴⁹ The baptism by the Spirit is consistent with the eschatological hope that was characteristic of Second Temple Judaism.²⁵⁰ Yet Matthew combines the refreshing "Spirit" of Mark with the "fire" of Source of Q to allude to judgment.²⁵¹ This supports the eschatological dimension of John's baptism as extrapolated from the prophets. Various interpretations of the coming of fire and spirit exist. Traditionally, the fire has been associated with the disastrous and destructive consequences of judgment. Dunn suggests that the righteous will be purified as in a refiner's fire, while the wicked will be consumed. While Menzies and Webb assert that the fire is for the wicked and the spirit for the righteous, the traditional understanding of Dunn seems more appropriate.²⁵² The language of John indicates that this baptism will be conducted with both "fire and spirit," rather than by one or the other. This understanding is also consistent with John's eschatological emphases and the prophetic texts from which this decree was likely based: Is. 44:3 and Ezek. 36: 25-27, 37:11-14. Campbell argues that John foresaw the kingdom as being ushered in through unparalleled times of national distress and natural disaster through which God would clear the wicked.²⁵³ In this sense, John baptized in expectation of what God would do on a deeper level.²⁵⁴ John definitely thought that his ministry pointed ahead to the action of God, though John more likely calculated, in contrast to his own prophetic sources, the coming of the messiah, of an intermediary, rather than of God Himself. Both Mal. 3:1 and Is. 40:3 are inconsistent with this idea, predicting the disastrous coming of God on the day of the Lord, rather than a human messiah.²⁵⁵ The Essenes also expected the direct action of God in the future and forecast a cleansing more complete and radical than their own.²⁵⁶

²⁴⁸ Gordon W. Cathrop, "The Origins and Early Meanings of Christian Baptism: A Proposal," *Worship*, 48 (November 1994), 50

²⁴⁹ Phelan, *CQ*, 20. Mk. 1:8.

²⁵⁰ Sanky, *JSNT*, 11.

²⁵¹ Boring, *NIBGM*, 158.

²⁵² R. Alastair Campbell, "Jesus and His Baptism," *Tyndale Bulletin*, 47 (November 1996) 194.

²⁵³ Campbell, *TB*, 199.

²⁵⁴ Cathrop, *W*, 514

²⁵⁵ Collins, *SL*, 30.

²⁵⁶ France, *JNLC*, 102. This point of apparent disagreement between John and the Essenes serves to increase the distance between them.

Campbell asserts that Jesus would not only believe this prediction, but that Jesus saw himself as agent of division, as evidenced by Mt. 10:34.²⁵⁷

Each Gospel has a unique understanding of John's role, all of which must be explored. Mark's Gospel is chiefly soteriological. In contrast to Matthew, Mark quotes John as mentioning only a baptism by Spirit. John refers to a "greater one," who would be the agent of this salvation. Seven possibilities exist for the identity of this person, derived from the Pharisaic questioning of John's own identity. First, in accordance with the above discussion, it could be God Himself. After all, God is the giver of the Spirit. However, the Baptist asserts that one will follow, whose sandals he is unfit to untie. Unless this phrase is the insertion of a later redactor, God is disqualified as the "greater one." Second, John may be referring to the messiah. The messianic figure is the embodiment of the Qumranic understanding: his baptism would be cleansing and relay the Spirit. Yet this imagery is vague and would not, historically, end the debate between the disciples of John and the disciples of Jesus. Third, the "greater one" could be the "Son of Man." The existence of such a transcendent figure of judgment has not, however, been proved in pre-Christian sources. Additionally, Daniel 7, the source of this idea, is without reference to fire or Spirit. Fourth, John could be referring to an eschatological prophet, though such a reference fails to correspond to the coming judgment. Fifth, John may be referring to an unknown eschatological figure.²⁵⁸ Sixth, J.A.T. Robinson proposed that Jesus represented Elijah. This would, however, have been unthinkable to John, who understood himself as the one who prepared the way, as the charismatic prophet who would anoint the messiah.²⁵⁹ Seventh, "the Prophet," referred to in Deut. 18:15, 18, would remake the miracles of the Exodus and, ultimately, form a new covenant and effect a political and physical salvation for Israel.²⁶⁰ The "greater one" is therefore best understood as a messianic type figure, rather than God Himself or another apocalyptic figure. This messianic figure would act in power, reproducing miracles, purifying his people, and establishing Israel as an independent nation once again.

Mt. 3:7-10 and parallels record the gathering of the Pharisees and Sadducees at the Jordan to interrogate John. In Matthew, the combination of the two groups represents total opposition by mainline Judaism, as would be characteristic throughout the ministry of Jesus. John's response to the Pharisees' claim to Abrahamic descent was to rely upon Is. 51:1-2, which asserts that the righteous will be judged by their fruits, rather than their ancestors. This reply evidences the reliance of John upon the prophets as

²⁵⁷ Campbell, *TB*, 200.

²⁵⁸ David A. Hubbard, *Mark 1-8:26*, vol. 34a, *The Word Biblical Commentary* (Dallas: Word, 1989), 22-23.

²⁵⁹ G. R. Beasley-Murray, *John*, vol. 36, *The Word Biblical Commentary* (Dallas: Word, 1999), 24.

²⁶⁰ Beasley-Murray, *WBCJ*, 24.

well as his fundamental concern for righteous, repentant living.²⁶¹ Matthew also evidences John's expectation of a physical agent by recording John's statement about untying sandals. Such a task was not even expected of Hebrew slaves; it was considered beneath them. John shows his awe for the "greater one" by suggesting that he is unfit for the duties beneath even slaves.²⁶²

John's challenge in Lk. 3:7-8 also echoes the prophets' conception of the "day of the LORD."²⁶³ This serves to confirm the eschatological emphases of John's ministry and underscores the interpretation of baptism of "fire and Spirit" as destructive and awesome. The felling of trees is another prophetic image found in Luke that alludes to apocalyptic eschatology.²⁶⁴ Luke's Gospel is also ripe with John's moral preaching, much of which would be echoed by Jesus. The very core of John's ethics was an emphasis on immediate social action: the wealthy should share their wealth and exploitation should end. The eschatological expectations of John, therefore, like those of Jesus, were balanced by a call for moral righteousness in the present. In accordance with Dodd, the kingdom would come, but was present as well.²⁶⁵ While waiting for the final baptism that would be inaugurated by the messianic figure, John encouraged and expected his followers to return to their towns and live a socially just life.²⁶⁶ These fragments, which further sever John's connections with the Essenes, would be echoed in the ministry of Jesus, a point which will be demonstrated in a later section.

The Gospel of John offers a perspective different from the Synoptics. In John's Gospel, the Baptist's identity is questioned. Despite the interpretation of Jesus present in the Synoptics, the Baptist very clearly denies being Elijah. Rather, as consistent with the above commentary of Malachi, John saw himself as a voice of announcement. His role was not as a miracle worker, but as the deliverer of a message, a witness.²⁶⁷ Indeed, though the dress of the Baptist initially seems to allude to Elijah, the Baptist's dress more appropriately suggests a wilderness prophet, the garb of a nomad, as Elijah did not wear a hair shirt and John did.²⁶⁸ John's Gospel also has the Baptist testifying to the pre-existence of Jesus, a witness

²⁶¹ Boring, *NIBGM*, 157.

²⁶² John Nolland, *Luke 1-9:20*, vol. 35a, *The Word Biblical Commentary* (Dallas: Word, 1989), 155.

²⁶³ Culpepper, *NIBGL*, 82. Found in passages such as Amos 5:18-20, Zeph. 1:14-15, 18, 2:2, and Is. 2:11-22, 13:9.

²⁶⁴ Nolland, *WBCL*, 149. Is. 6:13, 10:33-34, 32:19; Ezek. 31:12; and Dan. 4:14 all utilize such imagery.

²⁶⁵ Culpepper, *NIBGL*, 85.

²⁶⁶ Hollenbach, *ABD*, 897

²⁶⁷ Gail R. O'Day, *The New Interpreter's Bible: The Gospel of John* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1995) 9: 528.

²⁶⁸ Hubbard, *Mark 1-8:26*, 21.

absent from the other Gospels.²⁶⁹ Despite this recognition, John refers to Jesus as the "lamb of God," a title which may refer to Jesus as a Passover Lamb,²⁷⁰ but more likely, considering the Baptist's eschatological emphases, refers to Jesus as the warlike lamb of intertestamental apocalypticism. This lamb was a warlike messiah. It would not be understood as a ewe, but a powerful ram.²⁷¹ Both the Testament of Joseph 19:8 and the Testament of Benjamin, which are likely pre-Christian sources, contain and support such imagery.²⁷² This possible tension must be considered in light of the above analysis of the sources for the Baptist's ministry and preaching, many of which are heavily anchored in apocalyptic eschatology. John's own understanding of Jesus is therefore shrouded in controversy.

John and Jesus

Recent scholarship has questioned the depth of the relationship between John and Jesus. While the Synoptics include only the baptismal narrative and information concerning John's death, the Gospel of John describes a parallel ministry between the two.²⁷³ Indeed, John had referred to another, greater baptizer whose tools would be Spirit and fire.²⁷⁴ The ministry of Jesus was apparently controversial even as it occurred, evidenced by the complaint of the Baptist's disciples in the Gospel of John. Scholars assert this tradition to be historical due to the amount of embarrassment it potentially contained for the early church. Additionally, there would have been no plausible reason for the author of John to invent this narrative: it was likely a strong tradition.²⁷⁵ Probably, after the arrest of John and in order to distinguish his ministry from John's own, Jesus either ceased his own baptismal ministry or slowed it down substantially.²⁷⁶ Indeed, though not initiatory, John's baptism certainly served to link John's followers with both his ministry and eschatology. The same would be true of the baptisms conducted by Jesus.²⁷⁷ Links between the two are strong enough for scholars to theorize that Jesus was, at one time, a disciple of John.

There is a strong link between the preaching of John and that of Jesus. Both began with a call for repentance in expectation of the coming of the

²⁶⁹ Jn. 1:15-17.

²⁷⁰ Luke J. Chance Bradley, *The Mercer Commentary on the Bible: John* (Macon: Mercer, 1995) 1040. The Passover Lamb was a central and unifying image in John's Gospel. Nonetheless, such employment here seems inconsistent with John as revealed in the other Gospels.

²⁷¹ O'Day, *NIBGJ*, 518.

²⁷² Beasley-Murray, *WBCJ*, 24.

²⁷³ Jn. 3:22, 26, 4:1-3 indicate that Jesus baptized regularly with water.

²⁷⁴ Martinus C. De Boer, "Jesus the Baptizer: I John 5:5-8 and the Gospel of John," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 107 (March 1998), 96.

²⁷⁵ Collins, *SL*, 36.

²⁷⁶ Beasley-Murray, *BNT*, 69.

²⁷⁷ Beasley-Murray, *BNT*, 72.

kingdom.²⁷⁸ Indeed, the preaching of Jesus echoes every sentiment expressed by John.²⁷⁹ The social teachings of the Baptist would be echoed and stressed throughout the ministry and teachings of Jesus. Both emphasized the need for immediate social action in expectation of God's own action. While Mt. 11:16-19 makes clear some striking differences between the two, the ministry of Jesus reveals a continuity with John's. In this sense, Jesus did not duplicate John, but continued his sentiments. This continuity is, therefore, evident in the discontinuity.²⁸⁰

Jesus himself identified a strong link between himself and John. In Mt. 6:9-13, the disciples of Jesus ask him for instruction: they desired to learn the proper way to pray, as John had taught his own disciples. This parallelism between the teachings and expectations of the two is strengthened throughout the Gospel of Matthew. Jesus would identify himself as John's successor, continue in John's authority, and link the rejection of John's ministry to the rejection of his own.²⁸¹ Matthew would foreshadow the fate of Jesus with that of John,²⁸² as he would assert that both John and Jesus represented divine wisdom from God.²⁸³ Additionally, the Baptist's followers seem to naturally follow Jesus after the death of the Baptist.²⁸⁴ In John's Gospel, Jesus is recognized as John's designated successor.²⁸⁵ A clear and intentional continuity existed between Jesus and John, both in teaching and in the understandings of Matthew and Jesus himself.²⁸⁶

The Great Commission suggests that Jesus baptized. His disciples were, according to the Commission, to continue his baptismal work.²⁸⁷ Some have, however, suggested that the Commission, which concludes Matthew, is the result of later Christian editing for four reasons. First, it is only contained in Matthew. Second, it likely originally had no mention of baptism. Third, it bears the Trinitarian formula of a later date. Fourth, it portrays an attitude to Gentiles that is irreconcilable with the mission of the early church. Yet all four of these points are uncertain. In regard to the first, both the longer conclusion of Mark and Luke's Gospel contain similar commissions, using the language of John to call for a prophetic repentance. The second objection is based upon Eusebius' shorter reading, which assumed the unedited Gospel of Matthew to have been shorter, and is itself

²⁷⁸ This began for John in Mt. 3:2 and for Jesus in Mt. 4:17.

²⁷⁹ The following parallelisms are quite striking. Each begins with John's sentiment and then proceeds to give the location of Jesus' echo. Mt. 3:2 finds its parallel in 4:17; 3:7 in 12:34, 23:33; 3:8 in 7:16-20, 12:33; 3:9 in 8:11-12; 3:10 in 7:19; and 3:12 in 13:30.

²⁸⁰ France, *JNLC*, 96-97.

²⁸¹ Cf. Mt. 11:1-15, 27-33, 21:28-32.

²⁸² Mt. 9:11-13.

²⁸³ Mt. 11:16-19.

²⁸⁴ Mt. 14:12

²⁸⁵ Jn. 10:40-42.

²⁸⁶ France, *JNLC*, 97.

²⁸⁷ France, *JNLC*, 109.

quite controversial. Third, though the Trinitarian formula is a later insertion, its presence in the Commission does not exclude the possibility of first person commands issued by Jesus, even if they were later redacted. Finally, the mission to the Gentiles was never disputed, but only the conversion rites of Gentiles. The Great Commission is, therefore, worthy of consideration.²⁸⁸ The Commission reveals that Jesus was concerned with baptism, that he had been involved in baptismal ministries sometime in the course of his own ministry.

With such evident links, recent scholarship has theorized that Jesus was, at least for a time, a disciple of John. For one thing, Jesus was under and adhered to John's teachings, evidenced by his submission to the baptism of John. Also, John's belief in "he that comes after me" is, according to Wink and Grobel,²⁸⁹ indicative of John's belief that one of his disciples would become the "greater one." Additionally, John's initial withdrawal at Jesus' request for baptism has been theorized as a reaction against Jesus' request for discipleship at the hands of John.²⁹⁰ Jesus' role as servant, as opposed to a messianic role characterized by power, would remain consistent with this theory. Furthermore, in the recorded dispute between the parallel ministries of John and Jesus, Jesus is identified as "with John," indicative of a disciple relationship.²⁹¹ Historical criticism reveals that Jesus was, at least initially, subordinate to John. A relationship of discipleship is a likely explanation of this.²⁹² Such a relationship would also express the resentment of John's followers at the success of Jesus' own baptismal ministry. Had he been a disciple, he would have been considered a usurper. John's response was to assert that "I must decrease and he must increase," a statement that reflects that he had been in a superior and perhaps mentoring role. A disciple relationship between John and Jesus would also serve to explain the similarities between them in the Gospels and account for the continuity and familiarity in teaching and preaching.²⁹³ John's witness of and testimony concerning Jesus would also be explained, as such a relationship would spawn controversy regarding who was superior.²⁹⁴ Plus, the theory allows a reconciliation of Jn. 4:1-3 with Mk. 1:14. Jesus, after the imprisonment of John, would have either halted, moved, or slowed his baptismal ministry to avoid strong rivalry with John's disciples. With the imprisonment of his rabbi and mentor, Jesus would begin his own distinct ministry publicly.²⁹⁵

²⁸⁸ Beasley-Murray, *BNT*, 78-85.

²⁸⁹ William B. Badke, "Was Jesus a Disciple of John?," *The Evangelical Quarterly*, 62 (July 1990), 199-200.

²⁹⁰ Badke, *EQ*, 199-200.

²⁹¹ Jn. 3:26. Badke, *EQ*, 202.

²⁹² Johan Strijdom, "A Historical Jesus Hallucinating During His Initial Spirit Possession Experience: A Response to Stephen Davies' *Interpretation of Jesus' Baptism by John*," *Hervorende Teologiese Studies*, 54 (September-November, 1998), 595.

²⁹³ Badke, *EQ*, 203.

²⁹⁴ O'Day, *NIBGJ*, 529.

²⁹⁵ Perkins, *NIBGM*, 531.

Dodd asserted that Jn. 4:2, which ascribes the baptismal ministry of Jesus to the disciples, was the most edited verse in John. This effort to show that Jesus did not imitate John would not have been necessary had the two not been so closely intertwined.²⁹⁶ Luke's Gospel goes to great lengths to subordinate John to Jesus, not only in mission, but even in infancy and origin, as John's conception was purely biological while Jesus' was supernatural. Such an effort again shows the association that must have existed between the two.²⁹⁷ Lastly, in every strand of tradition, John pointed to a successor, the agent of God. Reason does not exclude the possibility that this successor learned from him in a discipleship role.²⁹⁸

A few voices have differing opinions, however. Pheme Perkins asserts that the Gospel of Mark seems to leave no room for Jesus to be John's disciple as, immediately after baptism, he is led into the wilderness for temptation.²⁹⁹ Yet Mark does not rule out the possibility of a return to John after temptation, which would have been appropriate considering John's own baptismal understanding anyway: it would represent the necessary repentance. In addition, Mark clearly uses John's baptismal ministry to frame Jesus' own ministry in Galilee. Jesus begins his Galilean ministry after John's baptism in Mark 1 and, after the death of John in Mark 6, ends his public ministry in Galilee. The execution of the Baptist also serves to foreshadow the death of Jesus in Mark. Mark even reveals that some thought of Jesus as the Baptist himself.³⁰⁰ Perkins' objection seems, therefore, unsubstantiated, considering the above clear linkages within Mark of Jesus to John. Luke hinders the discipleship theory by reporting Jesus' baptism after John's imprisonment. John is not only removed from the scene, but is not mentioned in connection with the event in Luke. However, the testimony of the other three Gospels, which speak in unison, should be heeded: John baptized Jesus. This potential problem presented by Luke is also remedied under the consideration that Luke de-emphasized the baptism of Jesus anyway, emphasizing the physical descent of the Spirit at Jesus' prayer instead.³⁰¹

The above objections fail to weaken the links between the two. While asserting that Jesus was the understudy of John for a period is theoretical, lacking explicit support in any biblical materials, the links demand consideration. The opinion of this writer is that Jesus did serve and study as a disciple of John, a role that would give Jesus an appreciation for baptism, John, and the substance of his preaching, understandings which Jesus would modify in respect to his own self-understandings.

²⁹⁶ O'Day, *NIBGJ*, 560.

²⁹⁷ Hollenbach, *ABD*, 890.

²⁹⁸ Badke, *EQ*, 202-204.

²⁹⁹ Perkins, *NIBGM*, 536.

³⁰⁰ Mk. 8: 28.

³⁰¹ Culpepper, *NIBGL*, 90.

Yet John would come to doubt Jesus as the agent of God he had predicted. Jesus had failed to baptize with fire and Spirit while alive, but did so only after his exaltation.³⁰² John's faith and patience in Jesus apparently began to wane, resulting in an inquiry.³⁰³ Indeed, Jesus would not fulfill John's messianic expectations: he was not the eschatological judge of awe. Instead, Jesus would reinterpret the popular messianic expectations.³⁰⁴ Jesus' response to John's inquiring disciples based his interpretation of his own ministry, his own wonders, upon the prophets. The healing of the blind,³⁰⁵ lame,³⁰⁶ lepers,³⁰⁷ deaf,³⁰⁸ dead,³⁰⁹ and a concern for the poor³¹⁰ proved Jesus as the agent of expectation with the same social concern as John.³¹¹ Jesus would show John that his predictions were correct, but that John's interpretations were wrong. The eschaton, like the kingdom, was both present and coming.³¹²

Summary of John's Baptism

John's ministry is best understood in light of the prophets. Modern scholarship has shed considerable doubt upon a link between John and the Essenes and has weakened reliance upon Jewish proselyte baptism as a necessary precursor for John. John's only certain precursor to the actual ablutions he performed, therefore, was the Levitical ablutions he would have been familiar with as a member of a priestly family, indeed, as a priest himself. Levitical understanding was clearly supported by a strong reliance upon prophetic eschatology. Though the prophetic sources would suggest that this action be conducted forcefully by God himself, the Gospels seem to portray John as reinterpreting his own sources to expect a messianic figure. John did not expect a suffering servant at all, therefore, but an apocalyptic warrior to cleanse Israel and free her from enemies.

John's baptism, therefore, was primarily eschatological. It served as a consecration for those who would be the remnant after the disastrous and awesome action of God in the world through the messianic figure. His emphasis upon social justice, to be practiced in expectation of the awesome coming of the messianic figure, represents prophetic continuity as well. The

³⁰² Collins, *SL*, 37.

³⁰³ Plummer, *ICCGSL*, 202.

³⁰⁴ Mawhinney, *WTJ*, 158.

³⁰⁵ Found in II Kgs. 6:17, Is. 29:18, 35:5, 42:18, 61:1 and fulfilled in Lk. 4:18, 7:21, 14:13, 21, 18:35.

³⁰⁶ Found in Is. 35:6 and fulfilled in Lk. 14:13, 21.

³⁰⁷ Found in II Kgs. 5:1-14 and fulfilled in Lk. 5:12-16, 17:12-19.

³⁰⁸ Found in Is. 29:18, 42:18, 35:5 and fulfilled in Lk. 11:14.

³⁰⁹ Found in I Kgs. 17:17-24, Is. 26:14 and fulfilled in Lk. 7:11-17, 8:40-42, 49-56.

³¹⁰ Found in Is. 4:18, 6:20, 14:13, 21, 16:19-31, 18:22, 19:8, 21:1-4 and characteristic of Jesus' preaching and ministry in Luke's Gospel.

³¹¹ Beasley-Murray, *NIBGL*, 161.

³¹² Guelich, *WBCGM*, 301.

recipients of John's baptism, given at least some scrutiny as to the daily conduct of their lives in an effort to gauge the prerequisite repentance, likely shared this eschatological view. Two groups existed among those baptized by John. The first would stay as his disciples, holding strongly to his eschatology. The second would return to their homes having heard his message and attempt to exhibit meaningful changes, practicing John's social reforms. The social teachings of John were heavily aimed at this larger second group.³¹³ In this sense, John's baptism was as much a baptism of eschatology as much as a baptism of repentance: it required an entrance into a new ethic, a new conceptual community.³¹⁴ John's baptism also represented a polemic against the established powers of mainline Judaism and even Herod, which would result in his death. Ultimately, this was probably the understanding John held for his own ministry, an understanding he would confer on his followers and the recipients of his baptism. Jesus did, in fact, represent a continuation of John's ministry, though Jesus would redefine and reinterpret it. This reinterpretation would hinge upon Jesus' understandings of ministry and identity, as would be revealed at his own baptism through three heavenly signs. While Jesus would echo the preaching of John and likely served as a disciple of John before baptism, his baptism would awaken a different sense of mission in Jesus from that of John.

Baptism of Jesus Greek Baptismal Diction

Several different Greek words are used in the baptismal narratives contained in the Gospels, each worthy of examination. βάπτω and βαπτίζω, the Greek verbs, imply total immersion, as opposed to λούω and νίπτω, which imply complete and partial washings, respectively.³¹⁵ βάπτω has the connotation of dipping, as in the dyeing process while βαπτίζω means causing to perish, as in drowning. It suggests the state of being flooded, of being soaked and covered by waters.³¹⁶ This is the word used to describe Namaans' dipping in the Jordan in II Kings 5:14 and is consistent with Paul's baptismal interpretation in Romans 6: it is death, a cleansing of the secular.³¹⁷ In the Septuagint, it is the term for Jewish ritual washings, suggesting immersion, and was used figuratively for the passage through the

³¹³ Badke, *EQ*, 197

³¹⁴ Badke, *EQ*, 196.

³¹⁵ Colin Brown, ed., "Baptism, Wash" *Dictionary of New Testament Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1975), 1: 143.

³¹⁶ H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 305.

³¹⁷ Brown, *DNTT*, 144.

Reed Sea³¹⁸ and later for martyrdom.³¹⁹ βαπτίζω would, hence, become the technical term for baptism in the New Testament.³²⁰ Yet it must be remembered that sacral baths were typical of ancient Oriental religions, occurring in Egyptian, Eleusinian, Bacchic, Apollinarian, Mithrian, and Pellesian contexts. The Gospel writers did, however, attempt to show John's baptism as unique, as non-syncretistic: it was apolitical and aritualistic, occurring once and for all with an eschatological purpose.³²¹ βαπτισμός is the classical Greek word meaning perishing. For the Hebrews, as used in the Septuagint, it would describe the cleansing of vessels by immersion.³²² βάπτισμα originated in the New Testament. Christians of the early church likely coined the term to indicate the uniqueness of baptism.³²³ It is used strictly in connection with martyrdom.³²⁴ βάπτειν initially meant to dip a morsel into wine, though it would later be used in association with Levitical washings.³²⁵ βαπτιστής would become John's surname: it is used only in attachment with John, even by Josephus.³²⁶ It therefore helps to express the uniqueness of an intermediary performing immersions.³²⁷ The language of the New Testament is quite clear. John's baptism represented a full immersion into the Jordan and was performed by John.³²⁸ Paul's comparison of baptism with death would have been appropriate, considering its classical usage, but would also have been consistent with John's own understanding if applied eschatologically. In such a context, baptism would represent a death to unrighteousness and a birth of repentance in preparation for God's actions.

³¹⁸ This interpretation would find continuity in the enigmatic temptation of Jesus for the forty days following his baptism. The combination of the two strongly echoes the narratives of Exodus. Sanky, *JST*, 13.

³¹⁹ William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, *A Greek English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952), 131.

³²⁰ Brown, *DNTT*, 144.

³²¹ Albrecht Oepke, "βάπτω, βαπτίζω," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978) 1: 530-531, 537.

³²² Brown, *DNTT*, 149.

³²³ Brown, *DNTT*, 149.

³²⁴ Arndt and Gingrich, *Lexicon*, 132.

³²⁵ Oepke, *TDNT*, 1:535.

³²⁶ Antiquities 18.116.

³²⁷ Brown, *DNTT*, 149.

³²⁸ Larry D. Robinson insists that John sprinkled in the Jordan, rather than immersed. He argues this as the reason for John's identification as the messiah, as based upon Is. 52:15, and finds continuity with Moses' sprinkling at Sinai. Ultimately, Robinson asserts that Jesus was sprinkled as a priestly dedication, based upon Num. 8:5-7, 20, Leviticus 8:6, and Ex. 29:4. Robinson's resistance has been noted, but seems quite incongruent with the language and context of the baptism. The imagery employed in the Gospels is very clear: immersion was the mode utilized by John in the Jordan. Larry D. Robinson, "True Baptism," *The AME Zion Quarterly Review*, 106 (October 1994), 30-31.

Three Signs³²⁹

The Opening of the Heavens

Before the descent of the dove and the mention of the voice from heaven, the Synoptics very clearly identify the heavens as opening. Unlike the other Synoptics, Mk. 1:9 uses σχιζομένους τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, which means that, instead of opening, instead of ἀνοίγω, the heavens were “torn apart” at the baptism of Jesus. While the opening of the heavens happened at various times in the Hebrew Bible,³³⁰ their tearing is seen only once: Is. 64:1-2.³³¹ In the Isaiah passage, the call is issued for God to tear the heavens and descend to earth in order to effect the salvation of God’s people. This call is consistent with the identity of the messiah, who would be God’s agent, and the “tearing” of the heavens would have likely recalled this passage in the minds of the reader. Yet strong correlations also exist with Ezek. 1:1: at the riverside, the Spirit fills, moves, and is accompanied by a voice from heaven. If the other Gospels are read against Mark, if the imagery is the “opening” of heaven rather than its “tearing,” then an association with Ezekiel is paramount. In this sense, Jesus might also be readily identified as the new Ezekiel, who will bring a message and change of hope to Israel.³³² Mark’s Gospel, therefore, intentionally begins with the

³²⁹ Joel Marcus actually asserts that there were four signs present at the baptism of Jesus. He asserts that the voice from heaven was only part of a larger vision experienced by Jesus at his baptism, the remainder of which is found in Lk. 10:18. The passage in question compares Satan’s fall from heaven with lightning. Marcus asserts that the vividness and swiftness of this imagery is characteristic of a vision. The larger Luke passage in which the vision is located seems inconsistent with the content of the vision, leading Marcus to suspect heavy redaction. According to Marcus, the vision of Satan’s fall should be included with the baptismal narrative for the following five reasons. First, it would be appropriate for Jesus to have experienced a vision at an event so significant as his baptism. The voice from heaven, claims Marcus, seems inauthentic, the product of a redactor, and fails to properly fit a vision’s context. Second, Marcus views the baptism of Jesus as strongly eschatological in nature, in which case the fall of Satan would be an appropriate vision. Indeed, the fall of the accuser, an obstacle to salvation, seems to better fit the eschatology of the scene, providing the remission of sins. Third, Marcus submits that the vision of Satan’s fall explains the separation of John and Jesus as Jesus would have thought, based upon this vision, that the eschaton had already begun. Fourth, the vision would also account for the central message of Jesus’ ministry thereafter: God’s royal rule. Lastly, the baptism is already linked with Satan due to the temptation immediately following the baptism. This parallelism, contends Marcus, was original to the text and pairs the descent of the Spirit with Satan’s fall. While Marcus’ analysis is certainly very interesting and even plausible, it is, nonetheless, conjecture that lacks evidence of being original to the text. Joel Marcus, “Jesus’ Baptismal Vision,” *New Testament Studies*, 41 (October 1995), 512-519.

³³⁰ As in Ezek. 1:1. While Mark’s language is typically more dramatic than the other Synoptics in conformity with Roman style, this linkage with Ezekiel appears quite strong and is therefore an exceptional case of diction worthy of consideration.

³³¹ David Ulansey, “Heavens Torn Open: Mark’s Powerful Metaphor Explained,” *Bible Review*, 7 (August 1991), 32.

³³² Ulansey, *BR*, 34.

heavens tearing, a scene that would only be witnessed by Jesus and would convey his own messianic identity to him as a new hope, God's action, for Israel.³³³ Ultimately, this "tearing" would grant access to God, as the Isaiah passage suggests.³³⁴ The other Gospels also identify a new hope and access to God that was gained through Jesus as analogous to the expectations of Ezekiel. The opening of the heavens, as recorded in the other Synoptics, would also be secretive, witnessed solely by Jesus as a prophetic anointing of his role in ministry: he would be the agent of God to bring Israel access to God, to bring hope.

The Dove

Ancient sources and traditions contain a plethora of dove imagery, each with a slightly different understanding. Ronnie S. Poon notes, despite a study of various Ancient Near Eastern texts and tradition, that there is no consensus for understanding the symbolism and imagery of the dove.³³⁵ For the purpose of this research, an interpretation based upon the preponderance of evidence will be attempted in order to hypothesize concerning the most likely meaning of the dove. Dale Allison Jr., a scholar devoted to the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls, asserts that the dove imagery is not characteristic of the narrative, but is a later Christian insertion.³³⁶ Despite this claim, the dove will be examined and its presence among Ancient Near Eastern religions and societies confirmed.

Within the Hebrew Bible itself, the dove resounds as a popular image. In Gen. 1:2, the Spirit of God, *רוח אלהים*, has often been suggested as hovering over the waters in the manner of a dove, not only in the rabbinic traditions, but also in the Babylonian Talmud. In this instance, the dove would symbolize a new creation at the baptism of Jesus, that the Spirit of God will continue its creative work.³³⁷ Is. 11:1-3 supports this interpretation by suggesting that the Spirit that hovered over the waters of creation will come upon the messiah.³³⁸ Though not included in the Hebrew canon, Psalms of Solomon 17:37 and 18:7, dated during the Second Temple Period, also suggest that the messiah would receive this special anointing.

³³³ Ulansey also asserts that the tearing of the heavens serves to form an inclusio in Mark, repeated at the tearing of the veil during the crucifixion. This outer veil, according to Josephus, resembled the heavens as it was adorned with stars, a sun, and a moon. This, according to Ulansey, shows God's descent at the beginning of the ministry of Jesus and at the end. Ulansey, *BR*, 37.

³³⁴ Donald H. Juel, "The Baptism of Jesus (Mark 1:9-11)," *Word and World* Supplement, 1 (1992), 121.

³³⁵ Ronnie S. Poon, "The Background and Dove Imagery in the Story of Jesus' Baptism," *Jian Dao: A Journal of Bible and Theology*, 3 (1995), 34.

³³⁶ Dale C. Allison Jr., "The Baptism of Jesus and a New Dead Sea Scroll," *Biblical Archaeology Review*, 18 (March/ April 1992), 58.

³³⁷ Allison, *BAR*, 59.

³³⁸ James R. Edwards, "The Baptism of Jesus According to the Gospel of Mark," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, 34 (March 1991), 47.

During the Second Temple Period, the Spirit was thought absent, prophecy perceived as dried up. As a result, texts like Isaiah and the Psalms of Solomon projected the renewal of the Spirit's activity, of prophecy, upon the messiah.³³⁹ The dove also exists in the flood narrative, this time returning the olive branch to Noah. Noah employs the dove as a symbol of peace: the time of judgment has ended and salvation has begun.³⁴⁰ As early as Gen. 15:9, the dove is present as a necessary part of the sacrificial system. Possible interpretations of the sacrificial dove will be explored along with the rabbinic commentaries. Dorruss suggests that the dove, as a messenger for Moses, expresses the closeness between father and son.³⁴¹ The Hebrew word for dove, transliterated as "Jonah," suggests the dove as a messenger to the outside.³⁴² Other varied interpretations and uses exist in the Old Testament, including the dove as a lover in the Song of Solomon, as silly in Hos. 7:11, and as a symbol for a fleeting Israel in Hos. 11:11.³⁴³ As was suggested earlier, the Old Testament is without consistent interpretation and understanding of the dove as a symbol or image. Nonetheless, the dove seems representative of a messenger function and as a symbol for the collective Israel in its primary uses.

Rabbinic understandings of the dove must also be explored through an analysis of the various collections of rabbinic literature. The Meklita has suggested that the dove was present at the crossing of the Reed Sea. This interpretation would suggest that Jesus was the new and restored Israel.³⁴⁴ The Mishnah and the Talmud both view the dove as primarily connected with the sacrificial system. The Talmud does, however, in Shabath 222, liken the dove with Israel.³⁴⁵ Berakoth 3a of the Talmud compares the cooing of the dove with the voice of God and identifies the dove with chastity in the story of the flood. This section also compares the hovering of the Spirit at creation with the hovering of a dove over its young.³⁴⁶ The Midrashim likens the dove primarily with Israel.³⁴⁷ Lastly, the Targumim associates the voice of a turtledove with the voice of the Spirit.³⁴⁸ Still without full consensus, the rabbinic understandings in general seem to identify the dove as a symbol for Israel.

The dove as symbol also found its way into Ancient Near Eastern myths. Mediterranean religions identified the dove with deities such as Aphrodite, Crete, Mycenae, Sicily, Carthage, Phoenicia, and Etruria.³⁴⁹ These figures

³³⁹ Edwards, *JETS*, 46.

³⁴⁰ Allison, *BAR*, 58.

³⁴¹ Poon, *JDJBT*, 35.

³⁴² Poon, *JDJBT*, 35.

³⁴³ Poon, *JDJBT*, 36.

³⁴⁴ Allison, *BAR*, 58.

³⁴⁵ Poon, *JDJBT*, 43.

³⁴⁶ Poon, *JDJBT*, 44.

³⁴⁷ Poon, *JDJBT*, 45.

³⁴⁸ Poon, *JDJBT*, 47.

³⁴⁹ Poon, *JDJBT*, 37.

were either kings or appeared with kings. Mediterranean religions connected the dove with elements of the soul that were guileless, such as chastity, gentleness, and affection.³⁵⁰ This illustrates a royal connotation of the dove that is balanced by an emphasis upon innocence.

Other Ancient Near Eastern literature provides possible clues for the understanding of the dove imagery. Philo 23:7 also associates the dove directly with Israel.³⁵¹ The dove also appears in pseudepigraphal writings. The Apocryphal book of Elijah 2:2 associates Christ with doves and doves with Israel, though it is also of later origin.³⁵² The Odes of Solomon 24 asserts that a dove hovering over the messiah demonstrates his sovereignty. While this text is likely a later Christian hymn, its interpretation of the dove is still relevant for this study.³⁵³ While the dove fails to appear in the Old Testament Apocrypha as an image, II Esdras 2:15, 5:25-27 identify the dove as a symbol for Israel.³⁵⁴ The Testament of Judah associates the dove with Sonship, suggesting the filial relationship between God and Jesus.³⁵⁵ The New Testament Apocryphal book of James 9 associates the presence of the dove with the king of promise. This would result in an identification of Jesus as a king at his baptism, an interpretation that would have been inconsistent at the time of the Gospels.³⁵⁶ Campbell suggests that doves were the only "innocent" birds: they were defenseless and could be sacrificed. In this sense, the dove would have designated the mission of Jesus and made Jesus' baptism the precursor for Israel's.³⁵⁷ Once again, though lacking total consensus, the bulk of Ancient Near Eastern literature identifies the dove with Israel.

The varying treatments of the Spirit's descent in the Gospels themselves are also significant. For one, Mark's Gospel, in contrast to the other Synoptics, asserts that the Spirit came "into" Jesus, rather than "upon" Jesus. Mark's Gospel identifies a dual result at the baptism of Jesus: it conveyed the Spirit's anointing, but also identified Jesus.³⁵⁸ Mark's Gospel also makes the descent of the Spirit a secret in comparison with the other Synoptics. For Mark, the voice and the Spirit were heard and seen, as revealed by Mark's second person language and the messianic secret characteristic of the entire Gospel,³⁵⁹ only by Jesus. Thus, for Mark, the

³⁵⁰ Poon, *JDJBT*, 38.

³⁵¹ Poon, *JDJBT*, 40.

³⁵² Poon, *JDJBT*, 41.

³⁵³ Poon, *JDJBT*, 40.

³⁵⁴ Poon, *JDJBT*, 39.

³⁵⁵ Mawhinney, *WTJ*, 51.

³⁵⁶ Allison, *BAR*, 58.

³⁵⁷ Campbell, *TB*, 206, 208.

³⁵⁸ Edwards, *JETS*, 48, 53.

³⁵⁹ Niedner argues that Jesus' call for secrecy after miracles, healings, and the Transfiguration exemplify this. While not all miracles and healings are done in privacy, the thrust of the Gospel is to show that Jesus' messianic identity was a secret to the physical world, made known only to Jesus and demons. Frederick A. Niedner, "Markan Baptismal

dove and voice were more significant for Jesus himself, rather than John the Baptist or any audience that may have existed.³⁶⁰ Luke's Gospel, in contrast, very intentionally asserts that the dove was physically seen and real. Despite this physical reality, only Jesus seems to see the dove in Luke. Luke's language, therefore, suggests that the dove portrayed the unique filial relationship between Jesus and God. In this sense, the dove does not, in Luke, represent a baptism of the Spirit, but a commissioning and a mark of identification.³⁶¹ While Matthew uses third person language, Matthew only lists Jesus as the witness of the dove and the opening of the heavens. In all three cases, therefore, the presence of the dove served as a milestone in the life of Jesus. The dove's descent served, according to the Gospels, as a sign between Jesus and God, as a confirmation of a life that would be dedicated to ministry. Consequently, the authors of the Gospels wished to communicate this relationship and landmark in the life of Jesus to their respective audiences as the beginning of Jesus' ministry. Thus, emphasizing the interpretation of the dove as indicative of a new birth, a new Israel, in the Gospels is appropriate.

Traditional Christian and Jewish scholarship has differed in its interpretation of the dove imagery. Justin Martyr claimed that the dove at Jesus' baptism echoed the Spirit's descent at creation. In this sense, the dove is indicative of a cosmic restoration to take place as the Spirit purified the dirty waters for new nourishment.³⁶² Cyril of Alexandria identified the descent of the Spirit as the first comparable indwelling by the Spirit.³⁶³ Origen, in contrast, identified the dove as wisdom.³⁶⁴ The Jewish scholar Philo identified the dove as a manifestation of divine wisdom.³⁶⁵

The dove's descent has been suggested as Jesus' prophetic anointing by the Spirit. In this sense, the Spirit will guide and confirm the mission of Jesus on earth.³⁶⁶ Winn, however, refutes this interpretation by noting that only Jesus, out of the many who came for baptism, received the Spirit, noting that the disciples received it at Pentecost, an event after their own baptisms.³⁶⁷ Orthodox Churches have suggested the presence of the dove as indicative, when coupled with the voice from heaven, of the presence and

Theology: Renaming the Markan Secret," *Currents in Theology and Mission*, 9 (April 1982) 100.

³⁶⁰ Niedner, *CTM*, 100.

³⁶¹ Nolland, *L*, 165.

³⁶² McDonnell, *TS*, 217-218.

³⁶³ McDonnell, *TS*, 222.

³⁶⁴ McDonnell, *TS*, 227.

³⁶⁵ W. C. Allen, *The International Critical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1965) 29.

³⁶⁶ John Thornhill, "Christ's Prophetic Anointing by the Spirit," *Pacifica: Journal of the Melbourne College of Divinity*, 1 (February 1988), 77.

³⁶⁷ Albert C. Winn, "The Role of the Holy Spirit in Baptism," *Reformed Liturgy and Music*, 29 (1995), 9.

confirmation of the Trinity at the baptism of Jesus.³⁶⁸ Luther asserted that the dove not only represented the Trinity, but purified the baptismal waters, establishing baptism as a sacrament.³⁶⁹ Joel Marcus, in contrast to some of the above understandings, submits that the descent of the dove was not for the personal empowerment of Jesus, but signified the birth of the new age.³⁷⁰ In accord with rabbinic scholars, Ezra Clark associated the innocence of the dove with the innocence that would result from Jesus' reign.³⁷¹ Alfred Plummer asserts that the dove, at least in Luke's Gospel, represents Israel.³⁷²

Despite the variety of possible interpretations, consensus can and, for the purpose of this paper, must be attempted. The dove should be viewed as an indicator of a new act in creation. Its presence, seen and understood only by Jesus at the time of the event, would mark Jesus as the hinge on which the new Israel would turn into existence: the dove told him to begin his ministry to Israel. Thus, while baptism conveyed the Spirit, it was to be an anointing, rather than the Adoptionism of Arius or the Gnostic idea that the divine descended into Jesus at baptism.³⁷³ Indeed, every Gospel suggests that Jesus was the Son before submitting to baptism. The descent of the dove, therefore, must not be understood as a reception of the Holy Spirit by Jesus, but as a reception of an anointing, a prophetic call, that would have consequences for Israel and the rest of creation.³⁷⁴ He knew, at baptism, that he would represent and strive for a new Israel in his mission, the precise details of which he would acquire from the voice of heaven.

The Voice from Heaven

The voice from heaven serves as the third supernatural sign accompanying the baptism of Jesus. In the Second Temple Period, when prophecy was thought absent, the Jewish teachers began to believe that God's revelation had become indirect. Instead of the direct voice of God, one might hear the "daughter of the voice," the בַּת קוֹל. Yet scholarship has asserted that this scene in the life of Jesus, just as the dove and the opening of heaven, is not an indirect revelation, it is not the "daughter of the voice," but God's direct revelation that will serve to identify the mission of

³⁶⁸ E. Turkina, "The Trinity Was Manifest in the Jordan," *Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate*, 1 (1989), 24.

³⁶⁹ Luther, *WW*, 9.

³⁷⁰ Joel Marcus, "Jesus' Baptismal Vision," *New Testament Studies*, 41 (October 1995), 521.

³⁷¹ Ezra P. Clark, *The International Critical Commentary on the Gospel of Saint Mark*, (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1948), 29.

³⁷² Alfred Plummer, *The International Critical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Luke*, (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1922), 99.

³⁷³ Gospel of the Ebionites 11.

³⁷⁴ Edwards, *JETS*, 53, 56.

Jesus.³⁷⁵ The use of γῖνομαι in the Septuagint to describe the voice confirms this. γῖνομαι, unlike λῡγω, denotes the speech of God alone, who does not speak in a human voice.³⁷⁶ The Gospel writers assert his voice as a real and direct revelation.

Traditional scholarship has identified the voice from heaven with two fragments from the Hebrew Bible. "You are my son," has been tied with Ps. 2:7. This passage is linked with a messianic oracle and would have identified Jesus as the messiah. "In you I am well pleased," has been associated with Is. 42:1, part of the servant songs. If this were the case, Jesus would have understood himself as a messiah contrary to popular expectations: he would suffer for the ultimate salvation of Israel.³⁷⁷ While the text of Isaiah is not directly quoted as the Gospels substitute the word "son" for the "servant" present in the Isaiah text, James R. Edwards argues that this is indicative of the filial relationship between Jesus and God. He also asserts that Is. 42:1 is unquestionably the dominant strain in the voice from heaven.³⁷⁸ "Son of God," therefore, would indicate the messiah, God's agent of salvation in the last days.³⁷⁹ The voice, therefore, would primarily serve to identify Jesus as a new messiah, a suffering servant.

Recent scholarship has challenged the link between the voice at baptism and the texts from Psalm 2 and Isaiah 42. William Stegner asserts that Jewish Christians who creatively blended the details with allusions and references from the Hebrew Bible with exegetical traditions creatively preserved the Gospel traditions.³⁸⁰ On this basis, he submits that the voice from heaven links Jesus with Isaac. The "beloved son" of the voice is directly reminiscent of Gen. 22:2 in which Abraham identifies his son Isaac as "beloved." In the Septuagint, this phrase occurs three times in Gen. 22, strengthening this correlation. Psalm 2, in contrast, fails to use the word "beloved," which would have been inappropriate in the discussion of a warlike messiah.³⁸¹ The correlation with Is. 42:1 is also strained as "well pleased" does not appear in the Septuagint Is. 42. This phrase is, however, present in Genesis 22 as well.³⁸² Rabbinic thought, as expressed in the Targumim, intensifies the linkage of the voice with Isaac. In the Targumim,

³⁷⁵ David A. Hagner, *Matthew 1-13*, vol. 33a, the *Word Biblical Commentary* (Dallas, Word, 1993), 58.

³⁷⁶ Matt. 3:17.

³⁷⁷ Juel, *WWS*, 121.

³⁷⁸ Edwards, *JETS*, 51.

³⁷⁹ Perkins, *NIBGM*, 526.

³⁸⁰ William Richard Stegner, "Early Jewish Christianity: A Lost Chapter?," *The Asbury Theological Journal*, 27 (Fall 1989), 18.

³⁸¹ Stegner, *ATJ*, 23.

³⁸² Stegner, *ATJ*, 23. The use of the third personal pronouns in Matthew nearly quotes the Septuagint's rendering of Genesis, though Luke and Mark differ slightly in word choice. Yet neither Mark nor Luke appear any closer to the synthesis of the Isaiah text and the Psalm in diction. As a result, though controversial, this writer credits Stegner's theory as superior, not only for the similarities with the Matthew text, but for other reasons to be discussed below.

Isaac was twenty-five at the time of his sacrifice. He therefore consented to God's sacrificial demand as an adult, seeking death. Upon the altar, Isaac would, like Jesus, receive a vision of the heavens opening, a voice calling from heaven, and the Spirit of the temple descending upon Mount Moriah, where it would later rest.³⁸³ In this sense, Jesus' experience at baptism would echo that of Isaac. He would be called to sacrifice his own life in order to fulfill the command of God. The signs from heaven, including the voice, opening of heaven, and the descent of the Spirit, allude to those experienced by Isaac and further strengthen the analogy. The traditional understanding is also weakened in that the messianic role was not familial, but an office to be fulfilled.³⁸⁴ Robert Guelich supports this interpretation, recognizing the parallelism between Jesus and Isaac as indicative of the special filial relationship between Jesus and God.³⁸⁵

Johan Strijdom has argued for the historicity of the voice and vision by the same criteria used to historically authenticate the baptism itself. The embarrassment of the scene to the early church is evidenced by the attributing of both the vision and voice to John the Baptist in the later Gospel of John.³⁸⁶ Synthesis of the three signs, therefore, serves to reveal Jesus' reception of his redemptive identity.³⁸⁷ He would be named as "my beloved" son, anointed by the Spirit, and called to action, which would be lived out in his ministry and self-sacrifice.³⁸⁸ This understanding, this call to ministry, stood in direct contrast with the messianic figure of both John's and popular expectation. The ministry of Jesus would not see him heroically defeat the Romans in war or exercise awesome and fearsome powers of judgment, but rather be characterized by his own self-sacrifice. This would result in John's querying of Jesus after Jesus began his distinct ministry along with the doubt of the Jews. All three signs, as consistent with

³⁸³ Stegner, *ATJ*, 24.

³⁸⁴ Stegner, *ATJ*, 26.

³⁸⁵ Robert A. *Mark 1-8:26*, vol. 34a, the *Word Biblical Commentary* (Dallas: Word, 1989), 34.

³⁸⁶ Strijdom, *HTS*, 592. Strijdom is an ardent advocate of the historical critical method. As a result, he refers to the vision of Jesus as a hallucination, though he credits this hallucination with changing Jesus' self-image, sense of mission, and perception of others. The fact that such a staunch member of the historical-critical school would endorse the baptismal event as historical is of value for this inquiry.

³⁸⁷ Indeed, no New Testament text mentions or presumes that Jesus was fully aware of his identity at birth. The signs, then, may be understood as the prophetic beginning of his ministry. Thornhill, *PJMCD*, 78. Nonetheless, Beasley-Murray suggests that Jesus' messianic identity was known before his baptism and that he was, therefore, baptized as a representative of the kingdom, as based upon the expression of doubt in Matt. 11:2. While Matthew's Gospel adds Jesus' pre-baptismal determination to the testimony of Mark, this cannot be interpreted as a pre-baptismal understanding of ministry and mission by Jesus, but merely as the will of Jesus to submit to baptism. In light of the above studies, Beasley-Murray's assertion seems to be an inappropriate understanding and would reduce the baptism of Jesus to an example. Beasley-Murray, *BNT*, 56-57.

³⁸⁸ John K. Stendahl, "The Outset," *Christian Century*, 114 (Dec. 24-31, 1997), 1219.

the teachings and foundations of John, are eschatological.³⁸⁹ The signs of heaven, as supported by Mark, would not complete Jesus' understandings of his mission, but serve to initiate them. Continued prophetic revelations would be necessary for Jesus to understand his mission as he conducted his ministry.³⁹⁰ His baptism was, like his eschatology, incomplete. Nonetheless, baptism conferred upon Jesus his identity and call, it began his reinterpretation of the eschatology of the general population and of his teacher, the Baptist.

Jesus' Baptismal Motivation

Matthew's Gospel contains the only direct biblical reference to the baptismal motivation of Jesus. Matt. 3:15 quotes Jesus' baptismal intention as "to fulfill all righteousness." This statement is quite ambiguous and leaves the reader wondering exactly what Mathew had in mind. As aforementioned, this section of the paper will attempt to form, in light of the above research, a cogent hypothesis for the baptismal motivations for Jesus of Nazareth. First, however, a survey of the opinions given by scholars will be profitable.

Luther argued that Christ was holier than baptism, that it was not required of him. Rather, his actions were intended to form an institution for the later Church.³⁹¹ This view lies in direct contrast with the prolegomena of this paper, dismissing the human faculties and limited understanding held by Jesus of Nazareth during his life on earth. It will, therefore, be rejected. Beasley-Murray, along with many other scholars, asserts that Jesus' baptism was not substitutory, but conciliatory. In this sense, Jesus was not baptized for mankind, but represented mankind's need for renewal. Baptism was, therefore, a sign of solidarity and a consecration: Jesus would bear the Spirit he would baptize with.³⁹² Like Luther's view, however, this presumes that Jesus was fully aware of his identity and mission prior to his baptism, which has been argued against throughout this paper and lies in contrast with the prolegomena.

Justin Martyr argued that Jesus did not receive baptism in order to be sanctified, since he was sinless. Justin also saw Jesus' baptism as a consecration that was confirmed by the descent of the Spirit upon his ascent from the Jordan. Yet Justin likens this consecration of Jesus to that of

³⁸⁹ Mawhinney, *WTJ*, 160.

³⁹⁰ Perkins, *NIBGM*, 535.

³⁹¹ Luther, *WW*, 8.

³⁹² Beasley-Murray, *BNT*, 57-61. This view is supported by the messianic expectations of Is. 11:2, 42:1, and 61:1. Yet this paper has argued that Isa. 42:1 and the office of the messiah in general are inappropriate for understanding the life and mission of Jesus, favoring an analogy between Jesus and Isaac. Brown, *DNTT*, 146. Cyril S. Rodd, "Baptism," *The Expository Times*, 104 (December 1992), 82. Edwards, *JETS*, 48. Such was the view of Feuillet as well.

Isaiah.³⁹³ In this sense, his opinion differs from the above in that he identified the baptism of Jesus as a prophetic anointing that Jesus sought in baptism.³⁹⁴ While Justin's theory is consistent with the results of Jesus' baptism, it seems inconsistent with his possible motivation. If Jesus was indeed limited by human faculties, as this paper presumes, it would be unlikely that he would have sought his own anointing. More than likely, the anointing was conferred upon him from above and as somewhat of a surprise.

Philoxenus likened the Jordan to the Red Sea. As a result, baptism was where Jesus crossed from the bondage of the law into freedom. Philoxenus asserted that even Jesus was previously in bondage.³⁹⁵ Mark McVann, similarly, identifies the baptism of Jesus as his renunciation of his membership in an adulterous and sinful generation. This action would repudiate the status quo of the time and identified Jesus with the marginal and the expendable.³⁹⁶

Clearly, Jesus submitted to a baptism of repentance. Though Matthew's Gospel neglects this element, it is present in the other Gospels. Some historical literature wrestles with this very issue, as in the dialogue between Jesus and his family contained in the Gospel of Hebrews.³⁹⁷ Few, if any, modern scholars suggest Jesus sinned as, according to the New Testament, Jesus was understood to have been without sin. Waetjen suggests that Jesus' baptism stemmed from genuine repentance that ended Jesus' participation in the structures and values of human society. This would end his submission to the mortal world into which he was born.³⁹⁸ These theories appear to have more merit and are indeed more enticing, though they are not fully satisfying.

Campbell asserts that Jesus received baptism in order to be identified with the eschatological community initiated by John's ministry, the remnant.³⁹⁹ This baptism would take emphasis away from the actions of the individual and emphasize God's action instead. Jesus would have, therefore, sought the coming eschatological promise of God's action and the forgiveness of sins, removing himself from the jurisdiction of Herod and

³⁹³ Isaiah 6.

³⁹⁴ McDonnell, *TS*, 219.

³⁹⁵ McDonnell, *TS*, 223.

³⁹⁶ Mark McVann, "Baptism, Miracles, and Boundary Jumping in Mark," *Biblical Theology Bulletin*, 21 (Winter 1991), 151.

³⁹⁷ France, *JNLC*, 103. Jesus, though without sin, may have been unaware of his own condition. Some have presumed that Jesus did know his true identity and mission prior to or even after his baptism. If such were the case, it is possible that Jesus perceived a need for repentance in his life from sin that he perceived to exist in his life. Such is mere speculation, but would help to explain the submission of Jesus to John's baptism of repentance. Indeed, it must be remembered that John would not have baptized Jesus without a statement of repentance and fruits of such a statement.

³⁹⁸ McVann, *BTB*, 152.

³⁹⁹ Campbell, *TB*, 204.

placing him under God alone.⁴⁰⁰ Jesus likely received baptism in order to enter into the eschatological community formed by John, a community that expected God's soon coming action in the world on behalf of a new Israel. His baptism was, however, also a repentance of sorts. The social reform emphasized both by John and Jesus makes it clear that both wished to transform their present while expecting a transformation of the future. Baptism was therefore motivated both actively and passively as Jesus sought to become a member of the new kingdom of God, of the remnant, repenting from the powers and structures at work in the world that are so often criticized by the prophets.

Implications for Contemporary Christianity

Baptism has held a variety of meanings throughout the history of the Church. As in the above section, this writer will briefly examine a variety of opinions before attempting to draw some conclusions, beginning with the interpretations included within Scripture. The Acts heavily associates baptism with conversion.⁴⁰¹ Additionally, the baptism of the 120⁴⁰² at Pentecost in Acts 2:1-4 appears to be a metaphorical cleansing from a crooked generation in expectation of an imminent wrath.⁴⁰³ Such changes of heart and of will are in no means incongruent with the intent of both John and Jesus as both saw baptism as a sign of an eschatological rebirth, of definite change. Luke also appears to parallel baptism with Pentecost, identifying baptism as the harbinger of the Spirit.⁴⁰⁴ Yet Acts does not associate baptism with the conferring of the Spirit, as some received the Spirit prior to baptism, as in the case of Cornelius and his household.⁴⁰⁵ This fits the above understandings as well. Acts also recounts two parallel situations concerning John's baptism. In the first, Apollos, who had been baptized by John, was not explicitly re-baptized⁴⁰⁶ while in the second, a group of John's disciples were.⁴⁰⁷ This incident is somewhat strange and difficult to explain. Apollos was possibly re-baptized, though this event was not mentioned in Acts. This is speculation, however. If the text suggests that Apollos was not re-baptized, the only possibility is that Apollos was not as firmly linked to the message and eschatology of John as the disciples of Acts 19 were. Apollos must have at least begun to understand the

⁴⁰⁰ Cathrop, W, 515. Freeman, Curtis W. "Matthew 3:13-17" *Interpretation* 47 (July 1993), 288. Stephen Humphries-Brooks, "Matthew," *Mercer Commentary on the Bible*, (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1995) 848. France, *JNLC*, 104.

⁴⁰¹ As in Acts 2:38, 22:16.

⁴⁰² Acts 1:15.

⁴⁰³ Collins, *SL*, 38.

⁴⁰⁴ Mawhinney, *WTJ*, 60.

⁴⁰⁵ Acts 6.

⁴⁰⁶ Acts 18: 24-26.

⁴⁰⁷ Acts 19:1-4.

redefinition that the mission and identity of Jesus applied to the messianic expectations of both John and popular Jewish thought. In such a case, Apollos would not have to identify himself with different eschatological and social understandings, as were apparently held by the disciples of Acts 19. Additionally, Acts identifies baptism more as an initiation into a community than as a witness to the world as some baptisms were conducted in the dead of night.⁴⁰⁸ Finally, as evident in the Apollos controversy, baptism meant association with Jesus and his eschatology.⁴⁰⁹

Paul would see baptism as the climactic point in the restoration of relations between man and God.⁴¹⁰ Baptism would yield a "newness of life." Such diction attests to an unfinished eschatology, a life that is yet to be worked out.⁴¹¹ This is consistent with the eschatological and social emphases of both John and Jesus. Paul also seemingly linked baptism with faith, assuming them simultaneous decisions.⁴¹² Again, a continuity exists as baptism required a real, observed repentance as a prerequisite. Both Titus and John emphasize the regenerative aspect of baptism.⁴¹³ Such an understanding echoes one of the functions of John's baptism: entrance into the new kingdom of God, the remnant. In Ephesians and Hebrews, baptisms are conducted "in Christ," a phrase added to describe one who followed the teachings of Jesus, as opposed to followers of John or even Bannus.⁴¹⁴

The references to baptism contained in Scripture represent a direct continuity with the teachings and hypothetical baptismal motives of Jesus. All stress the eschatological element, balanced by an emphasis on the contemporary social need. Writers of the New Testament would see, more and more, baptism as an initiation into God's new kingdom.

A brief examination of patristic teachings will also be helpful. Hilary of Poitiers argued that Jesus' baptism was iconic, that what was fully realized in Jesus was also fully realized in the believer at baptism.⁴¹⁵ While this phrase is highly ambiguous, he is likely referring to Jesus' reception of the Spirit, in which case Acts would find him in error. Indeed, this understanding would also be characteristic of Ephrem, Origen, and Cyril of Alexandria. If, on the other hand, Hilary meant that the believer will enter into a new kingdom, find direction for mission and identity, and continue and intensify repentance at baptism, it seems he was correct. Cyril of Jerusalem

⁴⁰⁸ Acts 16:35, 18:26-40. Robert H. Stein, "Baptism and Becoming a Christian in the New Testament," *The Southwestern Baptist Journal of Theology*, (Spring 1998), 14.

⁴⁰⁹ Beasley-Murray, *BNT*, 100.

⁴¹⁰ As in Gal. 3:26-27. Brown, *DNTT*, 146.

⁴¹¹ Collins, *SL*, 40. Romans 6. Hultgren, *WW*, 10. Hultgren also argues for Paul as having an eschatological understanding of baptism in general, one that represents continuity with that of John and Jesus.

⁴¹² Evidenced in Gal. 3:26-27. Stein, *SBJT*, 7.

⁴¹³ Brown, *DNTT*, 146.

⁴¹⁴ Collins, *SL*, 39.

⁴¹⁵ McDonnell, *TS*, 213.

understood the descent in the Jordan to have been simultaneously coupled with Jesus' descent into hell, in which he beat Satan in his own realm in order to bring freedom and life.⁴¹⁶ This understanding would parallel that of Marcus, that Jesus saw Satan fall after arising from the Jordan.⁴¹⁷ This can only be speculation, however, especially as the texts fail to link the demonic or Satan with baptism. Patristic teachings, therefore, seem to primarily have linked baptism with the indwelling of the Spirit, a concept that seems inappropriate with the message and intent of the Gospel writers.

The writers of the Reformers will also be examined in brief. Luther thought that baptism signified death and resurrection and, to that end, achieved entrance into a new covenant, though faith and repentance were prerequisites for such a covenant.⁴¹⁸ While the latter part seems consistent with the understandings of Jesus and John, the former is questionable. Jesus did understand baptism as a new beginning, though Luther's interpretation is read through Jesus' actual death and resurrection. This interpretation is invalid as Jesus had neither died or resurrected before being baptized. The position taken in the prolegomena of this paper is that Jesus did not have foreknowledge of these events. Calvin viewed baptism as a permanent penance which would replace burdensome confession.⁴¹⁹ Such an ideal neglects the call to ongoing social efforts and, due to its sacral nature, seems inconsistent with the texts. Zwingli reduced baptism to a sign that confirmed the willingness of the recipient to listen to God as delivered publicly to a community.⁴²⁰ While this seems somewhat proper and consistent, Zwingli's emphasis on publicity is in contrast with the examples of night baptism in Acts. The Anabaptists allowed baptism by believers only as a sign of obedience based on faith.⁴²¹ Once again, this idea requires no understanding of baptism's importance, only the recognition that it is important. If any of the Reformers seem to have emphasized repentance as a prerequisite for baptism, they certainly did not assume that Jesus' motivation might have been significant for a baptismal theology.

A brief glance at denominational ideas and the commentary of a few select scholars will conclude a glimpse of baptismal doctrines throughout the ages. The Reformed tradition identifies baptism as the seal and sign of the Sonship attained through faith.⁴²² The Methodist tradition confesses that baptism removes original sin and dedicates the recipient for a salvation in

⁴¹⁶ Kilian McDonnell, "The Baptism of Jesus in the Jordan and the Descent into Hell," *Worship*, 69 (March 1995), 101-103.

⁴¹⁷ Marcus, *NTS*, 512-519.

⁴¹⁸ Robert Latham, "Baptism in the Writings of the Reformers," *The Scottish Bulletin of Evangelical Theology*, 7 (Spring 1989), 22.

⁴¹⁹ John D. Witvliet, "Baptism as a Sacrament of Reconciliation in the Theology of John Calvin," *Studia Liturgica*, 27 (1997), 17-160.

⁴²⁰ Latham, *SJET*, 24.

⁴²¹ Latham, *SJET*, 25.

⁴²² Mawhinney, *WTJ*, 59.

the future.⁴²³ Evangelical doctrine views baptism as uniting the believer with Jesus in death and resurrection.⁴²⁴ Freeman identifies baptism as an eschatological sign that marks the recipient as a person whom will be used to construct and exemplify God's will.⁴²⁵ The baptism of Jesus, asserts Murray, would be fundamentally different from that of subsequent followers. His baptism was a sign of humility, a lowering, while that of the Church would raise the subject. Whereas the Spirit served to equip Jesus, it serves to renew the Church.⁴²⁶ While Jesus stooped to sinners, the believer will rise to sainthood. Finally, while Jesus was Son, the believer waits and expects adoption.⁴²⁷

None of the above denominational or scholastic approaches take the motives and understandings of Jesus seriously in congregational praxis. Contemporary Christianity must redefine its current baptismal understandings and even appropriations in order to more accurately parallel the life, teachings, and motivations of Jesus. To begin with, baptism must not be casually given, but should represent a level of achievement. John refused to baptize unrepentant Pharisees,⁴²⁸ but reserved baptism for those who had shown commitment: signs of repentance. In the second and third centuries of the common era, catechumens reviewed applicants for baptism, examining their motives and instructing them for two years before approving. Soon after, confirmation emerged as a sacrament in which the Holy Spirit was received. Baptism would be freely given or represent a power structure, depending upon the date and geography, from the fourth century of the common era on.⁴²⁹ The contemporary Christian must, therefore, reverse this decision and make repentance and commitment a prerequisite for baptism.

Baptism must also be redefined by examining it through the eyes of Jesus. The tendency of the contemporary Christian is to read all theological issues Christologically. As a result, baptism has become merely a sign of obedience that lacks understanding. Baptism must, however, be understood as an eschatological rebirth that is incomplete in and of itself. In a sense, its recipients are to await the action of God though, at the same time, they must strive to God's action themselves and in the present. Baptism represents a new identity that is to be worked out throughout the life of its recipients, just as salvation is.

While baptism serves as an initiation into a new kingdom, a remnant, it is an eschatological one and, as such, does not require or emphasize public

⁴²³ Ben Witherington III, "Troubling the Waters: The New Study on Baptism," *Quarterly Review*, 16 (September 1996), 77.

⁴²⁴ John Slott, "The Evangelical Doctrine of Baptism," *Churchman*, 112 (1998), 48.

⁴²⁵ Freeman, *Int.*, 289.

⁴²⁶ Beasley-Murray, *BNT*, 65.

⁴²⁷ Freeman, *Int.*, 288.

⁴²⁸ Lk. 3:7-9.

⁴²⁹ H.G. Schaefer, "Historical Development of the Theology and Practice of Baptism," *Theology and Life*, 9 (December 1989), 47.

attention. Too often, baptism is dismissed as a mere public profession of a believer's faith in Jesus. Yet if the contemporary Christian truly seeks to emulate Jesus, baptism is more personal than public. It is unclear how many witnessed the baptism of Jesus, though the diction of the Gospel writers suggests that his visions were private. It was also baptism that would begin Jesus' study under John and the beginnings of his self-understanding. If a candidate is instructed for two years, revealing a commitment to the church and discipleship in general, it seems that discipleship should continue, as it did for Jesus. After such a time, a believer will have reached a certain point of maturity, which would allow for a more complete understanding of Christian identity at baptism.

The contemporary Christian, if indeed to follow in the footsteps of Jesus, must therefore begin to struggle to better understand baptism. While not sacramental, baptism represents the step when an individual has decided to follow through with an already initiated repentance and identify oneself with a kingdom and a community that is not of this world, both in the present and in the future. As such, baptism is a formal representation of the decision and behavior necessary for salvation. Baptism is intimately related to the Christian identity and commissioning for ministry and it must, therefore, represent a culmination of prior efforts rather than instant initiation.

Bibliography

Commentaries of Ancient Texts

- Allen, W. C. The International Critical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew. Driver, S.R., A. Plummer, and L.A. Briggs, eds. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1965.
- Allison, Dale C. Jr. "The Baptism of Jesus and a New Dead Sea Scroll." Biblical Archaeology Review 108, 2 (March/ April 1992): 58-60.
- Ascough, Richard A. "An Analysis of the Baptismal Ritual in the Didache." Studia Liturgica 24, 2 (1994): 201-213.
- Badke, William B. "Was Jesus a Disciple of John?" The Evangelical Quarterly 62 (July 1990): 195-204.
- Beasley-Murray, G. R. Baptism in the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.
- Beasley-Murray, G. R. John. Vol. 36, Word Biblical Commentary eds. David A. Hubbard and Glenn W. Barker. Dallas: Word, 1999.
- Bernard, J.H. The International Critical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint John. Driver, S.R., A. Plummer, and L.A. Briggs, eds. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1958.
- Borchart, John Gerald L. "John" in Mercer Commentary on the Bible. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1995. 1043-1082.
- Boring, M. Eugene "The Gospel of Matthew" in The New Interpreter's Bible Volume 8. Nashville: Abingdon, 1995. 87-505.
- Campbell, R. Alastair "Jesus and His Baptism." Tyndale Bulletin 47 (November 1996): 191-214.
- Campbell, Maura "Symbol and Reality: Water, Life, Death, and Christian Baptism." Dialogue and Alliance: Journal of the International Religious Foundation, Inc. 4, 1 (Spring 1990): 48-60.
- Cathrop, Gordon W. "The Origins and Early Meanings of Christian Baptism: A Proposal." Worship 48 (November 1994): 504-522.
- Chance, J. Bradley "Luke" in Mercer Commentary on the Bible. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1995. 1007-1042.
- Clark, Ezra P. The International Critical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Mark eds. S.R. Driver and A. Plummer, and L.A. Briggs. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1948.
- Collins, Adela Yarbro "The Origin of Christian Baptism." Studia Liturgica 19, 1 (1989): 28-46.
- Culpepper, R. Alan "The Gospel of Luke" in The New Interpreter's Bible Volume 9. Nashville: Abingdon, 1995. 1-490.
- De Boer, Martinus C. "Jesus the Baptizer: I John 5:5-8 and the Gospel of John." Journal of Biblical Literature 107 (March 1998): 87-106.

- Dennison, Charles G. "How is Jesus the Son of God? Luke's Baptismal Narrative and Christology." Calvin Theological Journal 17 (April 1982): 6-25.
- Dowd, Sharon E. "Mark" in Mercer Commentary on the Bible. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1995. 975-1006.
- Edwards, James R. "The Baptism of Jesus According to the Gospel of Mark." Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society 34 (March 1991): 43-57.
- France, Richard T. "Jesus the Baptist?" in Jesus of Nazareth: Lord and Christ eds. Joel B. Green, Max Turner. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994. 94-111.
- Freeman, Curtis W. "Matthew 3:13-17." Interpretation 47 (July 1993): 285-289.
- Gaelich, Robert A. Mark 1-8:26. Vol. 34a. Word Biblical Commentary eds. David A. Hubbard, and Glenn W. Barker. Dallas: Word, 1989.
- Hagner, Donald A. Matthew 1-13. Vol. 33a. Word Biblical Commentary eds. David A. Hubbard and Glenn W. Barker. Dallas: Word, 1993.
- Harrington, Daniel J. The Gospel of Matthew. Vol. 1. Sacra Pagina Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1991.
- Harrisville, Roy A. III "Mark 1:4-11." Interpretation 48 (October 1993): 399-402.
- Hultgren, Arland J. "Baptism in the New Testament: Origins, Formulas, and Metaphors." Word and World 14, 1 (Winter 1994): 6-11.
- Humphries-Brooks, Stephen "Matthew" in Mercer Commentary on the Bible. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1995. 939-974.
- Johnson, Luke Timothy The Gospel of Luke. Vol. 3. Sacra Pagina Harrington, Daniel J., ed. Collegeville, Liturgical Press, 1991.
- Juel, Donald H. "The Baptism of Jesus (Mark 1:9-11)." Word and World Supplement 1 (1992): 119-126.
- Maloney, Francis J. The Gospel of John. Vol. 4. Sacra Pagina Harrington, Daniel J., ed. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1988.
- Marcus, Joel "Jesus' Baptismal Vision." New Testament Studies 41 (October 1995): 512-521.
- Marshall, I. Howard The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Testament Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.
- Mawhinney, Allen "Baptism, Servanthood, and Sonship." Westminster Theological Journal 49 (Spring 1987): 35-64.
- McDonnell, Kilian "Jesus' Baptism in the Jordan." Theological Studies 56, 2 (June 1995): 209-236.
- McVann, Mark "Baptism, Miracles, and Boundary Jumping in Mark." Biblical Theology Bulletin 21 (Winter 1991): 151-157.
- Niedner, Frederick A. "Markan Baptismal Theology: Renaming the Markan Secret." Currents in Theology and Mission 9 (April 1982): 93-106.

- Nolland, John Luke 1-9:20. Vol. 35a. Word Biblical Commentary eds. David A. Hubbard and Glenn W. Barker. Dallas: Word, 1989.
- O'Day, Gail R. "The Gospel of John" in The New Interpreter's Bible Volume 9. Nashville: Abingdon, 1995. 491-865.
- Perkins, Phema "The Gospel of Mark" in The New Interpreter's Bible Volume 8. Nashville: Abingdon, 1995. 507-733.
- Plummer, Alfred The International Critical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Luke Driver, S.R., A. Plummer, and L.A. Briggs, eds. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1922.
- Poon, Ronnie S. "The Background and Dove Imagery in the Story of Jesus' Baptism." Bible and Theology 3 (1995): 33-49.
- Porter, H. Boone "Day of the Lord: Day of Mystery." Anglican Theological Review 69 (January 1987): 3-11.
- Ricks, Stephen "Miqvaot: Ritual Immersion Baths in the Second Temple (Intertestamental) Jewish History." BYU Studies 36, 3 (1996-1997): 277-286.
- Robinson, Larry D. "True Baptism." The AME Zion Quarterly Review 106 (October 1994): 29-33.
- Rodd, Cyril S. "Baptism." The Expository Times 104, 3 (December 1992): 82-83.
- Sanky, Paul J. "Promise and Fulfillment: Reader Response to Mark 1:1-15." Journal for the Study of the New Testament 58 (June 1995): 3-18.
- Stein, Robert H. "Baptism and Becoming a Christian in the New Testament." The Southern Baptist Journal of Theology 2 (Spring 1998): 6-17.
- Taylor, Joan E. "John the Baptist and the Essenes." Journal of Jewish Studies 47 (Autumn 1996): 256-285.
- Ulansey, David "Heavens Torn Open: Mark's Powerful Metaphor Explained." Bible Review 7 (August 1991): 32-37.

Theological Discussions

- Bjornard, Reidar B. "Christian Baptism." Perspectives in Religious Studies 24, 1 (Spring 1997): 41-48.
- Burkhardt, John E. "The Meaning and Mystery of the Sacraments." Reformed Liturgy and Music 29, 1 (1995): 3-8.
- Cassidy, Edward I. Cardinal "Baptism and Koinonia." Ecumenical Trends 25 (February 1996): 17-23.
- Cheung, Tak-Ming "Understanding of Spirit-Baptism." Journal of Pentecostal Theology 8 (April 1996): 115-128.
- Johnson, Maxwell E. "Back Home to the Front: Eight Implications of Baptismal Spirituality." Worship 71 (November 1997): 482-504.

Letham, Robert "Baptism in the Writings of the Reformers." The Scottish Bulletin of Evangelical Theology 7 (Spring 1989): 21-44.

Luther, Martin "This is My Son, the Beloved: Sermon on the Baptism of Jesus." Word and World 16 (Winter 1996): 7-10.

McDonnell, Kilian "The Baptism of Jesus in the Jordan and the Descent into Hell." Worship 69 (March, 1995): 98-109.

Mikhael, Mary "The Baptism of the Lord." Theological Review 2 (1987): 6-8.

Phelan, John E. Jr. "Baptism in the New Testament." The Covenant Quarterly: (November 1995- February 1996): 17-38.

Pipken, H. Wayne "The Baptismal Theology of Balthasar Hubmaier." Mennonite Quarterly Review 65 (January 1991): 34-53.

Schaefer, H. G. "Historical Development of the Theology and Practice of Baptism." Theology and Life 9 (December 1989): 35-55.

Slott, Jon "The Evangelical Doctrine of Baptism." Churchman 12, 1 (1998): 47-59.

Stegner, William Richard "Early Jewish Christianity- A Lost Chapter?" The Asbury Theological Journal 44 (Fall 1989): 17-29.

Stendahl, John K. "The Outset." Christian Century 114 (December 24-31 1997): 1219.

Thornhill, John "Christ's Prophetic Anointing by the Spirit." Pacifica: Journal of the Melbourne College of Divinity 1 (February 1988): 68-84.

Turkina, E. "The Trinity was Manifest in the Jordan." Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate 1 (1989): 24-25.

Witherington, Ben III "Troubling the Waters: The New Study on Baptism." Quarterly Review 16 (September 1996): 73-78.

Witvliet, John D. "Baptism as a Sacrament of Reconciliation in the Theology of John Calvin." Studia Liturgica 27, 2 (1997): 152-165.

Vorgeimler, Herbert Sacramental Theology. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1992.

Wagner, Mervyn "Luther's Baptismal Theology: Implications for Catechesis." Lutheran Theological Journal 37 (December 1997): 105-114.

Winn, Albert C. "The Role of the Holy Spirit in Baptism." Reformed Liturgy and Music 29, 1 (1995): 9-11.

Lexicons, Dictionaries, And Other Tools

Arndt, William P., and F. Wilbur Gingrich, eds. A Greek English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952.

Beckwith, R. T. "Baptism, Wash" in the Dictionary of New Testament Theology Volume 1. ed. Brown, Colin. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1975. 143-154.

Hollenbach, Paul W. "John the Baptist" in The Anchor Bible Dictionary Volume 3: H-J. David ed. Noel Freedman. Doubleday: New York, 1992. 887-899.

Liddell, H. G., and R. Scott, eds. Greek-English Lexicon. Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1996.

Louw, Johannes P., and Eugene A. Nide, eds. Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based On Semantic Domains Volume 1. Broadway: United Bible Societies, 1988.

Neusner, Jacob, ed. Dictionary of Judaism in the Biblical Period: 450 B.C.E. to 600 C.E. Hendrickson: Peabody, 1999.

Oepke, Albrecht. "βάπτω, βαπτίζω" in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament Volume 1. ed. Gerhard Kittel. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978. 529-546.

Werblowsky, R. J. Zwi, Geoffrey Wigoder, eds. The Oxford Dictionary of the Jewish Religion. Oxford University Press: New York, 1997.

Witherington III, B. "John the Baptist" in Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels. eds. Joel Blanson, Scot McKnight, I. Howard Marshall. Intersity Press: Downer's Grove, 1992. 383-391.

Mt. 9:4, 12:25; Lk. 6:8, 9:47, 11:17; Jn. 6:64, 13:11 all describe miraculous "knowing" by Jesus. While not exhaustive, these passages represent a counter argument which suggests that Jesus did in fact use the power of his divine nature, at least on occasion. The opinion of this writer is that such powers are either the result of a politically sensitive Jesus or the result of Jesus' rather unique relationship to God.

Passages such as Phil. 2 and Heb. 2:9-18 are but two examples. The pericopes of Jesus' temptation, found in Mk. 1:12-14 and parallels, are also cogent illustrations of Jesus' submission to human limits and emotions, despite his divinity.

G. R. Beasley-Murray, Baptism in the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986) 13.

Beasley-Murray, Baptism, 11-12.

Joan E. Taylor, "John the Baptist and the Essenes," Journal of Jewish Studies, 47 (Autumn 1996) 260.

Adela Yarbro Collins, "The Origin of Christian Baptism," Studia Liturgica, 19 (1989) 1: 28.36.

Beasley-Murray, Baptism, 18.

Beasley-Murray, Baptism, 17.

Taylor, JJS, 277-279.

Taylor, JJS, 280.

Collins, SL, 28.

Beasley-Murray, Baptism, 15.

Taylor, JJS, 263.

Beasley-Murray, Baptism, 15-17.

Taylor, JJS, 282.

Taylor, JJS, 282.

Paul W. Hollenbach, "John the Baptist," in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, 3 (New York: Doubleday, 1992) 894.

Collins, SL, 32.

Beasley-Murray, Baptism, 20-22.

Collins, SL, 32.

Collins, SL, 33-34.

Collins, SL, 33-34.

Collins, SL, 33.

Arland J. Hultgren, "Baptism in the New Testament: Origins, Formulas, and Metaphors," *Word and World*, 14 (Winter 1994) 1: 8.

23 Richard T. France, *Jesus of Nazareth: Lord and Christ*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994) 99.

Beasley-Murray, Baptism, 22-31.

Collins, SL, 33.

Collins, SL, 34.

Collins, SL, 35.

Alan R. Culpepper, "The Gospel of Luke," in *The New Interpreter's Bible*, Nashville: Abingdon, 1995) 9: 81.

Collins, SL, 32.

Stephen J. Pfann, *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*, (Boston: Brill, 1999) 337.

Collins, SL, 35.

Stephen Ricks, "Miqvaot: Ritual Immersion Baths in the Second Temple (Intertestamental) Jewish History," *BYU Studies*, 36 (1996-1997) 3: 279. Cf. Deut. 23:10-11; Lev. 12:2, 15:9, 15:16-18; Num. 5:2-3.

Culpepper, NIBGL, 81.

Hollenbach. ABD, 887.

Beasley-Murray, BNT, 6.

Collins, SL, 35.

John E. Phelan, Jr., "Baptism in the New Testament," *The Covenant Quarterly*, (November 1995- February 1996), 19.

Beasley-Murray, BNT, 7.

Hultgren, WW, 7.

Such an understanding also lies behind the Lutheran and Catholic sacramental view of baptism: the waters convey the very presence of heaven. Martin Luther, "This is My Son, the Beloved: Sermon on the Baptism of Jesus," *Word and World*, (Winter 1996) 16:10. Ephrem would also echo such an understanding, suggesting that Christ deposited a robe of glory in the baptismal waters to restore Adam. Kilian McDonnell, "Jesus' Baptism in the Jordan," *Theological Studies*, (June 1995) 56: 2: 234.

Beasley-Murray, BNT, 2-6.

Maura Campbell, "Symbol and Reality: Water, Life, Death, and Christian Baptism," *Dialogue and Alliance*, 4 (Spring 1990) 1: 50-51.

Campbell, DA, 53.

Paul J. Sanky, "Promise and Fulfilment: Reader Response to Mark 1:1-15," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, 58 (June 1995), 7-9.

Eugene M. Boring, "The Gospel of Matthew," in *The New Interpreter's Bible*, (Nashville: Abingdon, 1995) 8: 156.

Phema Perkins, "The Gospel of Mark," in *The New Interpreter's Bible*, (Abingdon: Nashville, 1995) 8: 530.

Lk. 1:17, 76, 3:4

Mt. 13:7-11.

Collins, SL, 36.

Gordon W. Cathrop, "The Origins and Early Meanings of Christian Baptism: A Proposal," *Worship*, 48 (November 1994), 509.

Phelan, CQ, 20. Mk. 1:8.

Sanky, JSNT, 11.

Boring, NIBGM, 158.

R. Alastair Campbell, "Jesus and His Baptism," *Tyndale Bulletin*, 47 (November 1996) 194.

Campbell, TB, 199.

58Cathrop, W, 514.

Collins, SL, 30.

France, JNLC, 102. This point of apparent disagreement between John and the Essenes serves to increase the distance between them.

Campbell, TB, 200.

David A. Hubbard, Mark 1-8:26 , vol. 34a, The Word Biblical Commentary (Dallas: Word, 1989), 22-23.

G. R. Beasley-Murray, John, vol. 36, The Word Biblical Commentary (Dallas: Word, 1999), 24.

Beasley-Murray, WBCJ, 24.

Boring, NIBGM, 157.

John Nolland, Luke 1-9:20 , vol. 35a, The Word Biblical Commentary (Dallas: Word, 1989), 155.

Culpepper, NIBGL, 82. Found in passages such as Amos 5:18-20, Zeph. 1:14-15, 18, 2:2, and Is. 2:11-22, 13:9.

Nolland, WBCL, 149. Is. 6:13, 10:33-34, 32:19; Ezek. 31:12; and Dan. 4:14 all utilize such imagery.

Culpepper, NIBGL, 85.

Hollenbach, ABD, 897.

Gail R. O'Day, The New Interpreter's Bible: The Gospel of John (Nashville: Abingdon, 1995) 9: 528.

Hubbard, Mark 1-8:26, 21.

Jn. 1:15-17.

Luke J. Chance Bradley, The Mercer Commentary on the Bible: John (Macon: Mercer, 1995) 1040. The Passover Lamb was a central and unifying image in John's Gospel. Nonetheless, such employment here seems inconsistent with John as revealed in the other Gospels.

O'Day, NIBGJ, 518.

Beasley-Murray, WBCJ, 24.

Jn. 3:22, 26, 4:1-3 indicate that Jesus baptized regularly with water.

Martinus C. De Boer, "Jesus the Baptizer: I John 5:5-8 and the Gospel of John," Journal of Biblical Literature, 107 (March 1998), 96.

Collins, SL, 36.

Beasley-Murray, BNT, 69.

Beasley-Murray. BNT, 72.

This began for John in Mt. 3:2 and for Jesus in Mt. 4:17.

The following parallelisms are quite striking. Each begins with John's sentiment and then proceeds to give the location of Jesus' echo. Mt. 3:2 finds its parallel in 4:17; 3:7 in 12:34, 23:33; 3:8 in 7:16-20, 12:33; 3:9 in 8:11-12; 3:10 in 7:19; and 3:12 in 13:30.

France, JNLC, 96-97.

Cf. Mt. 11:1-15, 27-33, 21:28-32.

Mt. 9:11-13.

Mt. 11:16-19.

Mt. 14:12.

Jn. 10:40-42.

France, JNLC, 97.

France, JNLC, 109.

Beasley-Murray, BNT, 78-85.

William B. Badke, "Was Jesus a Disciple of John?," *The Evangelical Quarterly*, 62 (July 1990), 199-200.

Badke, EQ, 199-200.

Jn. 3:26. Badke, EQ, 202.

Johan Strijdom, "A Historical Jesus Hallucinating During His Initial Spirit Possession Experience: A Response to Stephen Davies' Interpretation of Jesus' Baptism by John," *Hervorende Teologiese Studies*, 54 (September-November, 1998), 595.

Badke, EQ, 203.

O'Day, NIBGJ, 529.

Perkins, NIBGM, 531.

O'Day, NIBGJ, 560.

Hollenbach, ABD, 890.

Badke, EQ, 202-204.

Perkins, NIBGM, 536.

Mk. 8: 28.

Culpepper, NIBGL, 90.

Collins, SL, 37.

Plummer, ICCGSL, 202.

Mawhinney, WTJ, 158.

Found in II Kgs. 6:17, Is. 29:18, 35:5, 42:18, 61:1 and fulfilled in Lk. 4:18, 7:21, 14:13, 21, 18:35.

Found in Is. 35:6 and fulfilled in Lk. 14:13, 21.

Found in II Kgs. 5:1-14 and fulfilled in Lk. 5:12-16, 17:12-19.

Found in Is. 29:18, 42:18, 35:5 and fulfilled in Lk. 11:14.

Found in I Kgs. 17:17-24, Is. 26:14 and fulfilled in Lk. 7:11-17, 8:40-42, 49-56.

Found in Is. 4:18, 6:20, 14:13, 21, 16:19-31, 18:22, 19:8, 21:1-4 and characteristic of Jesus' preaching and ministry in Luke's Gospel.

Beasley-Murray, NIBGL, 161.

Guelich, WBCGM, 301.

Badke, EQ, 197.

Badke, EQ, 196.

Colin Brown, ed., "Baptism, Wash" Dictionary of New Testament Theology (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1975), 1: 143.

H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, Greek-English Lexicon (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 305.

Brown, DNTT, 144.

This interpretation would find continuity in the enigmatic temptation of Jesus for the forty days following his baptism. The combination of the two strongly echoes the narratives of Exodus. Sanky, JSNT, 13.

William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, A Greek English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952), 131.

Brown, DNTT, 144.

Brown, DNTT, 144.

Albrecht Oepke,

Albrecht Oepke, "ἀλλοιούμαι" Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978) 1: 530-531, 537.

Brown, DNTT, 149.

Brown, DNTT, 149.

Brown, DNTT, 149.

Brown, DNTT, 149.

Arndt and Gingrich, Lexicon, 132.

Arndt and Gingrich, Lexicon, 132.

Oepke, TDNT, 1:535.

Antiquities 18.116.

Brown, DNTT, 149.

Larry D. Robinson insists that John sprinkled in the Jordan, rather than immersed. He argues this as the reason for John's identification as the messiah, as based upon Is. 52:15, and finds

continuity with Moses' sprinkling at Sinai. Ultimately, Robinson asserts that Jesus was sprinkled as a priestly dedication, based upon Num. 8:5-7, 20, Leviticus 8:6, and Ex. 29:4. Robinson's resistance has been noted, but seems quite incongruent with the language and context of the baptism. The imagery employed in the Gospels is very clear: immersion was the mode utilized by John in the Jordan. Larry D. Robinson, "True Baptism," *The AME Zion Quarterly Review*, 106 (October 1994), 30-31.

Joel Marcus actually asserts that there were four signs present at the baptism of Jesus. He asserts that the voice from heaven was only part of a larger vision experienced by Jesus at his baptism, the remainder of which is found in Lk. 10:18. The passage in question compares Satan's fall from heaven with lightning. Marcus asserts that the vividness and swiftness of this imagery is characteristic of a vision. The larger Luke passage in which the vision is located seems inconsistent with the content of the vision, leading Marcus to suspect heavy redaction. According to Marcus, the vision of Satan's fall should be included with the baptismal narrative for the following five reasons. First, it would be appropriate for Jesus to have experienced a vision at an event so significant as his baptism. The voice from heaven, claims Marcus, seems inauthentic, the product of a redactor, and fails to properly fit a vision's context. Second, Marcus views the baptism of Jesus as strongly eschatological in nature, in which case the fall of Satan would be an appropriate vision. Indeed, the fall of the accuser, an obstacle to salvation, seems to better fit the eschatology of the scene, providing the remission of sins. Third, Marcus submits that the vision of Satan's fall explains the separation of John and Jesus as Jesus would have thought, based upon this vision, that the eschaton had already begun. Fourth, the vision would also account for the central message of Jesus' ministry thereafter: God's royal rule. Lastly, the baptism is already linked with Satan due to the temptation immediately following the baptism. This parallelism, contends Marcus, was original to the text and pairs the descent of the Spirit with Satan's fall. While Marcus' analysis is certainly very interesting and even plausible, it is, nonetheless, conjecture that lacks evidence of being original to the text. Joel Marcus, "Jesus' Baptismal Vision," *New Testament Studies*, 41 (October 1995), 512-519.

As in Ezek. 1:1. While Mark's language is typically more dramatic than the other Synoptics in conformity with Roman style, this linkage with Ezekiel appears quite strong and is therefore an exceptional case of diction worthy of consideration.

David Ulansey, "Heavens Torn Open: Mark's Powerful Metaphor Explained," *Bible Review*, 7 (August 1991), 32.

Ulansey, BR, 34.

Ulansey also asserts that the tearing of the heavens serves to form an *inclusio* in Mark, repeated at the tearing of the veil during the crucifixion. This outer veil, according to Josephus, resembled the heavens as it was adorned with stars, a sun, and a moon. This, according to Ulansey, shows God's descent at the beginning of the ministry of Jesus and at the end. Ulansey, BR, 37.

Donald H. Juel, "The Baptism of Jesus (Mark 1:9-11)," *Word and World Supplement*, 1 (1992), 121.

Ronnie S. Poon, "The Background and Dove Imagery in the Story of Jesus' Baptism," *Jian Dao: A Journal of Bible and Theology*, 3 (1995), 34.

Dale C. Allison Jr., "The Baptism of Jesus and a New Dead Sea Scroll," *Biblical Archaeology Review*, 18 (March/ April 1992), 58.

Allison, BAR, 59.

James R. Edwards, "The Baptism of Jesus According to the Gospel of Mark," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, 34 (March 1991), 47.

Edwards, JETS, 46.

Allison, BAR, 58.

Poon, JDJBT, 35.

Poon, JDJBT, 35.

Poon, JDJBT, 36.

Allison, BAR, 58.

Poon, JDJBT, 43.

Poon, JDJBT, 44.

Poon, JDJBT, 45.

Poon, JDJBT, 47.

Poon, JDJBT, 37.

Poon, JDJBT, 38.

Poon, JDJBT, 40.

Poon, JDJBT, 41.

Poon, JDJBT, 40.

Poon, JDJBT, 39.

Mawhinney, WTJ, 51.

Allison, BAR, 58.

Campbell, TB, 206, 208.

Edwards, JETS, 48, 53.

Niedner argues that Jesus' call for secrecy after miracles, healings, and the Transfiguration exemplify this. While not all miracles and healings are done in privacy, the thrust of the Gospel is to show that Jesus' messianic identity was a secret to the physical world, made known only to Jesus and demons. Frederick A. Niedner, "Markan Baptismal Theology: Renaming the Markan Secret," *Currents in Theology and Mission*, 9 (April 1982) 100.

Niedner, CTM, 100.

Nolland, L, 165.

McDonnell, TS, 217-218.

McDonnell, TS, 222.

McDonnell, TS, 227.

W. C. Allen, *The International Critical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1965) 29.

John Thornhill, "Christ's Prophetic Anointing by the Spirit," *Pacifica: Journal of the Melbourne College of Divinity*, 1 (February 1988), 77.

Albert C. Winn, "The Role of the Holy Spirit in Baptism," *Reformed Liturgy and Music*, 29 (1995), 9.

E. Turkina, "The Trinity Was Manifest in the Jordan," *Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate*, 1 (1989), 24.

Luther, WW, 9.

Joel Marcus, "Jesus' Baptismal Vision," *New Testament Studies*, 41 (October 1995), 521.

Ezra P. Clark, *The International Critical Commentary on the Gospel of Saint Mark*, (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1948), 29.

Alfred Plummer, *The International Critical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Luke*, (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1922), 99.

Gospel of the Ebionites 11.

Edwards, JETS, 53, 56.

David A. Hagner, *Matthew 1-13*, vol. 33a, the Word Biblical Commentary (Dallas: Word, 1993), 58.

Matt. 3:17.

Juel, WWS, 121.

Edwards, JETS, 51.

Perkins, NIBGM, 526.

William Richard Stegner, "Early Jewish Christianity: A Lost Chapter?," *The Asbury Theological Journal*, 27 (Fall 1989), 18.

Stegner, ATJ, 23.

Stegner, ATJ, 23. The use of the third personal pronouns in Matthew nearly quotes the Septuagint's rendering of Genesis, though Luke and Mark differ slightly in word choice. Yet neither Mark nor Luke appear any closer to the synthesis of the Isaiah text and the Psalm in diction. As a result, though controversial, this writer credits Stegner's theory as superior, not only for the similarities with the Matthew text, but for other reasons to be discussed below.

Stegner, ATJ, 24.

Stegner, ATJ, 26.

Robert A. Mark 1-8:26, vol. 34a, the Word Biblical Commentary (Dallas: Word, 1989), 34.

Strijdom, HTS, 592. Strijdom is an ardent advocate of the historical critical method. As a result, he refers to the vision of Jesus as a hallucination, though he credits this hallucination with changing Jesus' self-image, sense of mission, and perception of others. The fact that such a staunch member of the historical-critical school would endorse the baptismal event as historical is of value for this inquiry.

Indeed, no New Testament text mentions or presumes that Jesus was fully aware of his identity at birth. The signs, then, may be understood as the prophetic beginning of his ministry. Thornhill, PJMCD, 78. Nonetheless, Beasley-Murray suggests that Jesus' messianic identity was known before his baptism and that he was, therefore, baptized as a representative of the kingdom, as based upon the expression of doubt in Matt. 11:2. While Matthew's Gospel adds Jesus' pre-baptismal determination to the testimony of Mark, this cannot be interpreted as a pre-baptismal understanding of ministry and mission by Jesus, but merely as the will of Jesus to submit to baptism. In light of the above studies, Beasley-Murray's assertion seems to be an inappropriate understanding and would reduce the baptism of Jesus to an example. Beasley-Murray, BNT, 56-57.

John K. Stendahl, "The Outset," *Christian Century*, 114 (Dec. 24-31, 1997), 1219.

Mawhinney, WTJ, 160.

Perkins, NIBGM, 535.

Luther, WW, 8.

Beasley-Murray, BNT, 57-61. This view is supported by the messianic expectations of Is. 11:2, 42:1, and 61:1. Yet this paper has argued that Isa. 42:1 and the office of the messiah in general are inappropriate for understanding the life and mission of Jesus, favoring an analogy between Jesus and Isaac. Brown, DNTT, 146. Cyril S. Rodd, "Baptism," *The Expository Times*, 104 (December 1992), 82. Edwards, JETS, 48. Such was the view of Feuillet as well.

Isaiah 6.

McDonnell, TS, 219.

McDonnell, TS, 223.

Mark McVann, "Baptism, Miracles, and Boundary Jumping in Mark," *Biblical Theology Bulletin*, 21 (Winter 1991), 151.

France, JNLC, 103. Jesus, though without sin, may have been unaware of his own condition. Some have presumed that Jesus did know his true identity and mission prior to or even after his baptism. If such were the case, it is possible that Jesus perceived a need for repentance in his life from sin that he perceived to exist in his life. Such is mere speculation, but would help to explain the submission of Jesus to John's baptism of repentance. Indeed, it must be remembered that John would not have baptized Jesus without a statement of repentance and fruits of such a statement.

McVann, BTB, 152.

Campbell, TB, 204.

Cathrop, W, 515. Freeman, Curtis W. "Matthew 3:13-17" *Interpretation* 47 (July 1993), 288. Stephen Humphries-Brooks, "Matthew," *Mercer Commentary on the Bible*, (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1995) 848. France, JNLC, 104.

As in Acts 2:38, 22:16.

Acts 1:15.

Collins, SL, 38.

Mawhinney, WTJ, 60.

Acts 6.

Acts 18: 24-26.

Acts 19:1-4.

Acts 16:35, 18:26-40. Robert H. Stein, "Baptism and Becoming a Christian in the New Testament," *The Southwestern Baptist Journal of Theology*, (Spring 1998), 14.

Beasley-Murray, BNT, 100.

As in Gal. 3:26-27. Brown, DNTT, 146.

Collins, SL, 40. Romans 6. Hultgren, WW, 10. Hultgren also argues for Paul as having an eschatological understanding of baptism in general, one that represents continuity with that of John and Jesus.

Evidenced in Gal. 3:26-27. Stein, SBJT, 7.

Brown, DNTT, 146.

Collins, SL, 39.

McDonnell, TS, 213.

Kilian McDonnell, "The Baptism of Jesus in the Jordan and the Descent into Hell," *Worship*, 69 (March 1995), 101-103.

Marcus, NTS, 512-519.

Robert Latham, "Baptism in the Writings of the Reformers," *The Scottish Bulletin of Evangelical Theology*, 7 (Spring 1989), 22.

John D. Witvliet, "Baptism as a Sacrament of Reconciliation in the Theology of John Calvin," *Studia Liturgica*, 27 (1997), 17-160.

Latham, SJET, 24.

Latham, SJET, 25.

Mawhinney, WTJ, 59.

207 Ben Witherington III, "Troubling the Waters: The New Study on Baptism," *Quarterly Review*, 16 (September 1996), 77.

John Slott, "The Evangelical Doctrine of Baptism," *Churchman*, 112 (1998), 48.

Freeman, *Int*, 289.

Beasley-Murray, BNT, 65.

Freeman, Int, 288.
Lk. 3:7-9.

H.G. Schaefer, "Historical Development of the Theology and Practice of Baptism," *Theology and Life*, 9 (December 1989), 47.

ATTENTION DEFICIT/ HYPERACTIVITY DISORDER

ELISHA OLIVER

Introduction

Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) is an ailment that affects both children and adults. People with ADHD show such outward signs as an inability to sit still, an inability to stay focused, and excessive talking. Although there is no cure for ADHD, there are very effective treatment options available which include things like medication, psychotherapy, social skills training, and support groups. The exact cause of ADHD is unknown, however, some believe that things such as brain development, genetics, and premature birth can possibly cause ADHD.

Symptomology

Attention Deficit Disorder (ADD) and Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) are two behavioral disorders that affect both children and adults, but more often they are diagnosed in children (Berk 294). ADHD causes people to have great difficulty staying on task for more than a few minutes. Children with ADHD often act impulsively, ignore social rules, and lash out with hostility when frustrated (Berk 295). Many with ADHD are unable to sit still, plan ahead, finish tasks, or be fully aware of what is going on around them (Neuwirth 1). In some situations, children with ADHD seem to be fine; so it may appear that those with ADHD can control their behaviors. However, Neuwirth (1) suggests that this is not necessarily true. For children with ADHD, these difficulties often weaken relationships with others and disrupt their lives, consume all of their energy, and diminish their self-esteem (Neuwirth 1). Gender differences have also been suggested. According to Brush (117), the "text book ADD girl tends to be a dreamy type who seems content to stare off into space. The typical ADD boy is the mad little dervish who seems to have inhaled rocket fuel for breakfast" (Brush 117). Many children, but not all, are hyperactive in conjunction with attention deficit, which is one reason why the two are often grouped together (Zimmerman 1). These children tend to act out more in class and are unable to control themselves under normal circumstances.

Adults who have ADHD have such characteristics as procrastination, absentmindedness, forgetfulness, and disorganization (Zimmerman 2).

The following is a table showing the symptoms or characteristics of a child with ADHD according to Neuwirth (3):

<i>ADHD Symptoms</i>	<i>ADHD Symptoms Defined</i>
INATTENTION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have hard time keeping their mind on any one thing • Get bored with a task after only a few minutes • Give effortless, automatic attention to activities and things they enjoy • Cannot focus deliberate, conscious attention to organizing and completing a task or learning something new
HYPERACTIVITY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Always seem to be in motion • Cannot sit still • May dash around or talk incessantly • May squirm in seat or roam around the room • May wiggle their feet, touch everything, or noisily tap pencil • Feel intense restlessness • Very fidgety or try to do several things at once, bouncing around from one activity to the next
IMPULSIVITY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unable to curb their immediate reactions or think before they act • May blurt out inappropriate comments • May run into the street without looking • Hard to wait for things they want or take their turn in games • May grab toys from other children or hit when they are upset

Prevalence

Overall, huge numbers of people are affected by ADHD. Many studies have indicated, according to Barkley's 1998 article in *Scientific American*, that "between 2 and 9.5 percent of all school-age children worldwide have ADHD" (2). Furthermore, Neuwirth, concluded that "on the average, at least one child in every classroom in the United States needs help for the disorder" (1).

ADHD affects as many as 2 million American children, which is 3 to 5 percent of all children (Neuwirth 1). However, ADHD is not just a problem in the United States. Researchers have identified it in every nation and culture they have studied (Barkley 2). It also does not always end when childhood ends. Barkley's study showed that roughly two thirds of the 158 children he evaluated in the 1970's still had the disorder in their twenties and "many of those who no longer fit the clinical description of ADHD were still having significant adjustment problems at work, in school or in other social settings" (2). One problem that exists is whether or not these adult sufferers are still being treated for the disorder.

In a study by Marshall, Schafer, O'Donnell, Elliot, and Handwerk, a ratio of 1 girl to every 5 or 6 boys is fairly typical of students with ADD and the ratio was 9 to 1 in the group of students with ADHD (8). In a study by Berry, Shaywitz, and Shaywitz, they concluded that "girls with ADD are being under-identified because they are less likely than their male counterparts to exhibit behavioral disturbances" (qtd. in Marshall, Schafer, O'Donnell, Elliot, & Handwerk 8).

Nosology & Diagnosis

Currently, the DSM IV groups all deficits under the designation of ADHD or attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder. There are three main sub-groups within ADHD which are as follows: ADHD predominantly inattentive, ADHD predominantly hyperactive-impulsive, and ADHD combined (Zimmerman 1). The first two are listed with their differences in the following chart that Zimmerman (2) included in her book to help children who have ADHD:

ADHD INATTENTIVE	ADHD HYPERACTIVE/IMPULSIVE
Difficulty Organizing Tasks – Can't Get Started	Talks Too Much
Mental Restlessness – Constant Brain Chatter	Difficulty Doing Tasks Alone
Easily Distracted – Attention Easily Diverted	Physical Restlessness – Finger Tapping, Leg Restlessness
Difficulty Completing Tasks	Engages in Physical Daring Activities
Shifts from One Task to Another	Always on the Go, As if Driven by a Motor
Difficulty Sustaining Attention – Can't Focus	Impulsive
Doesn't Appear to Listen to Others	Often Interrupts Others
Constantly Loses Possessions	Impatient
Forgets Easily – Can't Remember "To Do's"	Unpredictable Behavior
Trouble Keeping Track of Events – Sequence	Hot and Explosive Temper
Adapted from DSM-IV criteria	

As one can see from the above chart and information, the diagnosis process for those with ADHD can be difficult. The diagnosis process of ADHD is individualized depending upon the circumstances. There are no standards or levels of "normal" which apply to all cases, so doctors must rely upon their own judgement to diagnose the individual patient (Zimmerman 3).

Additionally, diagnosis and treatment can be made by professionals in various medical specialties. The following chart presented by Neuwirth in a special booklet about ADHD describes the type of specialists who are eligible to diagnose and treat the disorder (9):

SPECIALITY	CAN DIAGNOSE ADHD	CAN PRESCRIBE MEDICATIONS, IF NEEDED	PROVIDES COUNSELING OR TRAINING
PSYCHIATRIST	Yes	yes	yes
PSYCHOLOGIST	Yes	no	yes
PEDIATRICIAN or FAMILY PHYSICIAN	Yes	yes	no
NEUROLOGIST	Yes	yes	no

Different professionals diagnosis the disorder depending upon the individual circumstances. For instance, if the child is acting out at school, the teacher may refer him or her to the school psychologist. If the parents suspect something wrong, they may consult their family physician concerning the issue. The different practitioners tend to vary in respect to the frequency in which they diagnose the disorder. Certain data available in the National Institutes of Health (NIH) 1998 Consensus Statement said that “family practitioners diagnose more quickly and prescribe medication more frequently than psychiatrists or pediatricians” (10). The 1998 NIH Consensus Statement went further to say that family practitioners spend less time making the diagnosis, falsely use the child’s response to medication as a diagnostic criterion, and are less likely to recognize coexisting disorders which causes them to over-diagnose the disorder (9-11). The Consensus Statement also said, “there is often poor communication between diagnosticians and those who implement and monitor schools. In addition, follow-up may be fragmented and inadequate” (10). The communication break between the medical world and the school-based world causes the over-diagnosis according to the Consensus Statement (10). Furthermore, according to the NIH, the medical world tends to rely more on the parents’ input than the teacher’s input (10). In doing so, medical doctors neglect to consider an important piece of the puzzle, that is, the behavior and academic performance of the child in the school setting (10). Problems such as these can lead to over-diagnosis as well as misdiagnosis among those children who need to be diagnosed the most.

In order to ameliorate some of these problems some of the research (NIH Consensus Statement, 1998; Neuwirth, 1999; Barkley, 1998) supports a multi-disciplinary approach to diagnosis. According to the 1998 Consensus Statement:

School-based clinics with a team approach that includes parents, teachers, school psychologists, and other mental health specialists may be a means to remove these barriers and improve access to assessment and treatment. Ideally, primary care practitioners with adequate time for consultation with such school teams should be able to make an appropriate assessment and diagnosis, but they should also be able to refer to mental health and other specialists when deemed necessary. (12)

In agreement with the 1998 NIH Consensus Statement, Neuwirth, states that diagnosis of ADHD is a step-by-step multi-disciplinary process (9-10). According to Neuwirth, no matter the specialist's expertise, he or she must first gather information that will rule out other possible reasons for the child's behavior (9). Next, he or she will take a look at both the home and school environments, examining all school and medical records (10). Then, he or she may have a doctor rule out certain medical problems such as emotional disorders, undetectable seizures, poor vision or hearing, and allergies or nutritional problems such as caffeine highs that might make the child overactive (10). The next step is to gather information pertaining to the child's ongoing behavior in order to compare these behaviors to the symptoms and diagnostic criteria listed in the DSM (10). This step will involve talking to the child, parents, and teachers; observing the child in different settings; and obtaining the observations of the child's teacher(s) and parents (10). During this part of the evaluation the child may be tested for social adjustment, mental health, and learning disabilities (10).

According to Neuwirth:

In looking at the data, the specialist pays special attention to the child's behavior during noisy or unstructured situations, like parties, or during tasks that require sustained attention, like reading, working math problems, or playing a board game. Behavior during free play or while getting individual attention is given less importance in the evaluation. In such situations, most children with ADHD are able to control their behavior and perform well. (10)

Next, the specialist will piece together all of the information to create a profile of the child's behavior. After referring to the DSM-IV criteria for ADHD, the specialist will identify whether or not the child's hyperactive, impulsivity, and inattention are long-lasting enough to be diagnosed with ADHD (Neuwirth 10).

According to Neuwirth, adults who are being diagnosed with ADHD, for the most part, are asked to describe their own experiences (10). In some cases, the specialist will ask parents to describe what the adult was like as a child (Neuwirth 10). Roommates or spouses are asked to describe and rate the current behaviors of the adult (Neuwirth 10). The adult diagnosis process is much like that of the child diagnosis process, only more emphasis is placed upon the patient's perspective (Neuwirth 10).

Outline of Characteristics of ADHD

- I. The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition (DSM-IV) lists the following as criteria for determining ADHD (also qtd. in Hardman, Drew, Egan 177):
Either 1 or 2:

1. Six or more of the following symptoms of inattention have persisted for at least six months to a degree that is maladaptive and inconsistent with developmental level:
 - a. Often fails to give close attention to details or makes careless mistakes in schoolwork, work, or other activities.
 - b. Often has difficulty sustaining attention in tasks or play activities.
 - c. Often does not seem to listen when spoken to directly.
 - d. Often does not follow through on instructions and fails to finish schoolwork, chores, or duties in the workplace (not due to oppositional behavior or failure to understand instructions).
 - e. Often has difficulty organizing tasks and activities.
 - f. Often avoids, dislikes, or is reluctant to engage in tasks that require sustained mental effort (such as schoolwork or homework).
 - g. Often loses things necessary for tasks or activities (e.g. toys, school assignments, pencils, books, or tools).
 - h. Is often easily distracted by extraneous stimuli.
 - i. Is often forgetful in daily activities.
1. Six or more of the following symptoms of hyperactivity-impulsivity have persisted for at least 6 months to a degree that is maladaptive and inconsistent with developmental level:

Hyperactivity

- a. Often fidgets with hands or feet or squirms in seat.
- b. Often leaves seat in classroom or in other situations in which remaining seated is expected.
- c. Often runs about or climbs excessively in situations in which it is inappropriate.
- d. Often has difficulty playing or engaging in leisure activities quietly.
- e. Is often "on the go" or often acts as if "driven by a motor."
- f. Often talks excessively.

Impulsivity

- a. Often blurts out answers before questions have been completed.
 - b. Often has difficulty waiting turn.
 - c. Often interrupts or intrudes on others.
- A. Some hyperactive-impulsive or inattentive symptoms that caused impairment were presented before age 7 years.

Some impairment from the symptoms is present in two or more settings (school or work and home).

- B. There must be clear evidence of clinically significant impairment in social, academic, or occupational functioning.

- C. The symptoms do not occur exclusively during the course of a Pervasive Developmental Disorder, Schizophrenia, or other Psychotic Disorder and are not better accounted for by another mental disorder (e.g. Mood Disorder, Anxiety Disorder, Dissociative Disorder, or a Personality Disorder).

Code based on the following:

Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder, Combined Type: if both Criteria A1 and A2 are met for the past six months.

Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder, Predominantly Inattentive Type: if Criterion A1 is met but Criterion A2 is not met for the past six months.

Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder, Predominantly Hyperactive-Impulsive Type: if Criterion A2 is met but Criterion A1 is not met for the past six months.

Coding note: For individuals (especially adolescents and adults) who currently have symptoms that no longer meet full criteria, "In Partial Remission" should be specified.

Treatment

Several articles (Barkley; Neuwirth; NIH Consensus; & Zimmerman) suggest that there is no cure for ADHD. While there is no cure, there are very effective treatments available to help the ADHD patients learn to cope with and control the disability (Barkley 7). However, the treatments come with problems and controversy.

Neuwirth lists three kinds of stimulants that seem to be effective in treating both adults and children with ADHD (13). They are methylphenidate (Ritalin), dextroamphetamine (Dexedrine or Dextrostat), and pemoline (Cylert). As stated, "Cylert usually lasts from 5–10 hours, while Ritalin and Dexedrine come in short-term pills that last about 3 hours, as well as long-term preparations that last through the school day" (Neuwirth 13).

One problem with the use of drugs to treat ADHD is that the use of drugs to treat ADHD sometimes works and sometimes does not work. Eldridge, who has written about his own experience with ADD, was thought to have ADHD in grade school and took Ritalin, but it did not seem to help much for him because he was not the hyperactive type of attention-deficit disorder. Therefore, he had to learn to control his ADD by other means. Eldridge said, "to do well takes the desire for success. This piece of the puzzle must come from within" (8).

There is much controversy over the use and misuse of drugs to fight ADHD. Many articles (Smith; Adesman; & Eldridge) have been written concerning the effects of stimulants and whether or not the child actually needs the drug. Such controversy helps to stimulate many thoughts on the negative effects of these drugs on the young child.

Society often tends to believe that all ADHD patients are taking drugs to control their behaviors, but this is not always true. Barkley and others (Neuwirth & Zimmerman) write that a large number of ADHD patients do take stimulants to control their disorder, but the majority take those drugs in conjunction with other very effective treatments according to the majority of the research available.

Ian K. Smith, M.D. recently wrote an article for Time Magazine in which he discusses the negative effects of Ritalin on toddlers. Smith said, "Although Ritalin is a relatively mild drug with well-known side effects, nobody is sure what it does to the rapidly developing brain of the very young child" (84). He also says that to some critics, Ritalin has become, "the symbol of everything that is wrong with our over-diagnosed and over-prescribed society" (84). Further studies on Ritalin show that the challenge to these kinds of stimulants is to use them wisely. Dr. Andrew Adesman wrote an article for Newsweek which suggests that medication is not the whole secret to managing ADHD; one must also "establish consistent routines, reinforce appropriate behavior, and make educational accommodations" (81). Adesman also stated that each of the three prescribed stimulants have a 75 percent response rate and that overall, 90 percent of school-age children with ADHD respond well to one of the three stimulants (84).

Research (Zimmerman; Barkley; & Adesman) agrees that not only drug therapy, but other programs such as nutrition and diet changes and encouraging children with this disorder early on in life are needed to prevent self-esteem problems later (Zimmerman 8-9). According to a 1998 article in Scientific American by Russell Barkley, "treatment for ADHD should include training parents and teachers in specific and more effective methods for managing the behavioral problems of children with the disorder" (7).

Neuwirth lists several options available for intervention (5-8). He states that in order to choose the best therapist for the child suffering, one must know some basic facts about the various types of interventions (5-8). The following table constructed by the present author lists and describes those types of interventions as they were presented in Neuwirth's 1994 National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) publication (16-17).

INTERVENTION APPROACHES FOR PATIENTS WITH ADHD

<i>PSYCHOTHERAPY</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Works to help patients like and accept themselves despite the disorder 2. Patients talk with the therapist about upsetting thoughts and feelings 3. They explore self-defeating patterns of behavior 4. They learn alternative ways to handle their emotions
<i>COGNITIVE-BEHAVIORAL THERAPY</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Helps people work on immediate issues 2. It supports patients directly in changing the behavior 3. Support might be to help patient to think through tasks and organize work 4. Support might be to give praise or rewards each time new behavior is achieved
<i>SOCIAL SKILLS TRAINING</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Can help children learn new behaviors 2. Therapist discusses and models appropriate behaviors like waiting for turn, sharing toys, asking for help, or responding to teasing 3. For example, a child might learn to read facial expressions and tone of voice to respond more appropriately
<i>SUPPORT GROUPS</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Connect people who have common concerns 2. Groups deal with issues of children's disorders 3. Members share frustrations and successes, referrals to qualified specialists, and information about what works, as well as their hopes for themselves and their children. 4. There is strength in numbers and sharing helps them to know they are not alone
<i>PARENTING SKILLS TRAINING</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Offered by therapists or in special classes 2. Gives parents tools and techniques for managing their child's behavior 3. One technique is "time out" 4. Teaches parents to praise child's strengths and abilities

(qtd. in Neuwirth 16-17)

Etiology

The range of things that could possibly cause ADHD is vast from genetic factors to environmental factors. With such little amount of concrete proof of the causes of ADHD, more extensive research is needed to fully determine them.

Some recent research shows that there may be a genetic predisposition for ADHD. Psychiatrist Edwin H. Cook, of the University of Chicago, remarked, "The reality is that whether any individual child [with the inherited gene] with ADHD will respond to stimulants is largely an issue of luck because we have not measured all of the reasons for variability in response" (qtd. in Bower 359). Given this kind of statement, the present author believes that it would be unethical for practitioners to try such luck with patients.

Stephen P. Hinshaw of the University of California, Berkeley, also researched the genetic predisposition of ADHD. He concluded that, "Psychosocial interventions can profoundly affect ADHD, even if a genetic predisposition is involved" (qtd. in Bower 388). With research such as this, the present author believes that these sorts of interventions should be attempted prior to trying the "luck" type of intervention as described above.

The following table constructed by the present author illustrates some possible things that can both cause and not cause ADHD (Neuwirth 6-7):

<i>CAN CAUSE ADHD</i>	<i>CANNOT CAUSE ADHD</i>
Premature birth	Too much television
Mother's use of cigarettes, alcohol, and other drugs during pregnancy	Food allergies
Toxins in the environment	Excess sugar
Genetics	Poor home life
Brain Development both during and after pregnancy	Poor schools

Outline of Various Causes of ADHD

I. Brain Activity:

- A. "Researchers have found that children with ADHD are less capable of preparing motor responses in anticipation of events and are insensitive to feedback about errors made in those responses" (Barkley 2-3).

- B. Certain areas of the brain responsible for attention have been found to be smaller in children with ADHD (Barkley 3).
- C. The reason for the area of the brain being smaller is still unknown for certain, but some studies suggested that “mutations in several genes that are normally very active...might play a role” (Barkley 3).
- D. Many researchers now believe that ADHD is a polygenetic disorder, where more than one gene contributes to it (Barkley 3).
- E. A study done using a PET (positron emission tomography) observed the brain at work. Investigators found important differences between those with ADHD and those without. Glucose is the brain’s main source of energy. The brains of ones with ADHD used less glucose in the areas that control attention, which shows they were less active (Neuwirth 6-7).
- V. Mother’s use of cigarettes, alcohol and other drugs during pregnancy
 - A. Studies have shown that use of such drugs may distort developing nerve cells in the brain of the fetus (Neuwirth 6-7).
 - B. Drugs, like cocaine, “seem to affect the normal development of brain receptors,” which help to transmit incoming signals from the skin, eyes, and ears, and help to control our responses to the environment (Neuwirth 7).
 - C. Some scientists and researchers believe that such damage may lead to or cause ADHD in the unborn fetus.
- V. Toxins in the environment
 - A. Lead: It is found in dust, soil, some water pipes, and flaking paint in areas where leaded gasoline and paint were once used. Although only a few cases have been found, some studies have shown that children exposed to lead have developed symptoms associated with ADHD (Neuwirth 6-7). This exposure must occur during early childhood according to research done by Berkley (3-5).
- V. Genetics
 - A. A 1995 study by Edwin H. Cook and colleagues at the University of Chicago showed that children with ADHD were “more likely than others to have a particular variation in the dopamine transporter gene DAT1” (qtd. in Barkley 4).
 - B. Another study done by Gerald J. LaHoste of the University of California at Irvine in 1996 found “that a variant of the dopamine receptor gene D4 is more common among children with ADHD” (qtd. in Barkley 4).
 - C. Children with ADHD tend to have at least one close family member who has ADHD and “at least one-third of all fathers

who had ADHD in their youth bear children who have ADHD” according to Neuwirth’s ADHD study (7).

- D. Another alarming feature is that the majority of identical twins share the trait (Neuwirth 7).
- E. The National Institutes of Health researchers are currently looking for a gene that “may be involved in transmitting ADHD in a small number of families with a genetic thyroid disorder” (Neuwirth 7).

V. Premature birth

- 1. Dr. Miriam Cherkas-Julkowski did a study to show that premature birth can lead to certain learning disabilities, ADD, and language impairments.
- 2. Cherkas-Julkowski concluded that as early as 13 to 15 months of age one can see that something is not right; “The children with ADD tended to be more engaged with a greater number of attentional shifts” (9). “These patterns of attention deployment at 13 and 15 months might be used as indicators of later processing problems” (Cherkas-Julkowski 11).

Conclusion

Research continues to be done on Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder. According to Neuwirth “Although no immediate cure is in sight, a new understanding of ADHD may be just over the horizon” (19). More new information concerning the role of the brain in ADHD is progressively arising among scientists with the use of a variety of research tools and methods (Neuwirth 19). Barkley suggests that the day will come “when genetic testing for ADHD may become available and more specialized medications may be designed to counter the specific genetic deficits of the children who suffer from it” (7). With such a positive outlook on the future of the disorder, the effective treatment and cure of ADHD may in fact be just around the corner.

References

- Adesman, Andrew. Does My Child Need Ritalin? *Newsweek* 24 Apr. 2000: 81.
- Barkley, Russell. Attention-Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder. *Scientific American* (2000): Sept. 1998. <http://www.sciam.com/1998/0998issue/0998barklev.html>
- Berk, Laura. Development Through the Lifespan. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon Publishers, 1998.
- Bower, B. "Gene May Alter Ritalin's Effects in ADHD." *Science News* 156 (1999): 359.
- . "Kids' ADHD Care Gets a Wake-up Call." *Science News* 156 (1999): 388.
- Brush, Stephanie. "Can't Concentrate? Utterly Overwhelmed? Feeling Fidgety?." Mademoiselle (2000): 117-119.
- Cherkes-Julkowski, Miriam. "Learning Disability, Attention-Deficit Disorder, and Language Impairment as Outcomes of Prematurity: A Longitudinal Descriptive Study." Journal of Learning Disabilities 31 (1998): 294-313.
- "Diagnosis and Treatment of Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder." NIH Consensus Statement Online. (2000): 1996
http://odp.od.nih.gov/consensus/cons/110/110_statement.htm.
- Eldridge, Ken. "Fighting an Unknown Enemy: ADHD." The Education Digest (2000): 7-9.
- Hardman, M, Drew, C, & Egan, M.W. Human Exceptionality: Society, School, and Family. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn an Bacon Publishers. (1999).
- Marshall, Richard M.; Schafer, Vickie A.; O'Donnell, Louise; Elliot, Jennifer; & Handwerk, Michael L. "Arithmetic Disabilities and ADD Subtypes: Implications for DSM-IV." Journal of Learning Disabilities 32 (1999): 239-253.
- Neuwirth, Sharyn. "Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder." National Institute Of Mental Health Website. (1996): 3 Dec. 2000 <http://www.nimh.nih.gov/publicat/adhd.cfm>.
- Smith, Ian K. "Ritalin for Toddlers." *Time* (2000): 84.
- Zimmerman, Marcia. The ADD Nutrition Solution: A Drug -Free 30-Day Plan. New York: Owl Books/Henry Holt and Co., 1999.

THE EVOLUTION OF THE ENGLISH SECOND PERSON SINGULAR PERSONAL PRONOUN VIA THE MECHANISMS OF NATURAL SELECTION AS SEEN THROUGH THE LORD'S PRAYER

ARY BOTTOMS

Introduction

Language evolves. This evolution can be observed in the very word, language. The earliest definite root is found in the Latin word *lingua*, which means tongue. This word later developed a connotation, which meant tongues or languages. In the modern French the word changed to *la langue*, and the plural form became *les langues*. The singular form means tongue or language just as in the Latin. The plural form has a similar etymology. The final major step in the evolution of this word came when it moved from the French during and immediately following the Norman Conquest of 1066. During and after this period the French *la langue* was transformed by various means in to the English language.

In 1066 William, duke of Normandy, defeated Harold Godwinson, king of England, at the battle of Hastings, and shortly thereafter assumed the throne of England. After this, William began to replace Anglo-Saxon nobles with Norman nobles, and Anglo-Saxon clergy with Norman clergy. As a result of this Norman French and later Anglo-Norman began to replace Anglo-Saxon as the language of the educated classes.

During this period there were effectively three languages in active use in England; French, the language of the nobility; Latin, the language of the Church; and Early Middle English, the language of the common man. During the first hundred or so years after the Norman Conquest these languages remained distinct, however, eventually these languages began to merge. The final result is what is now called Modern English.

Modern English contains many words that have their origins in Old English: heaven (*heofunum* in Old English), for example. It also contains

many words from French and Latin, such as temptation (temptation) and debt (debitus). Why would some words remain basically the same, while others were changed dramatically, and still others were completely replaced by the Latin or French? The answer lies in an exploration of the social structure of post conquest England.

Old English basically disappeared in the upper classes immediately after the Norman Conquest. Therefore, when the Norman kings began to think of themselves as English, at about the time of Henry V, many words had fallen out of use, *gyltas*, for example. The priests and others had to take a French or Latin word and put it in the place of the English word since they did not know what the English word was. That is how many of the English words were completely replaced. The one part of speech that remained basically the same after 1066 was the pronoun. Pronouns would have been used in everyday speech by commoners. Thus, when English reemerged, the scholars had somewhere to turn in order to determine what the English equivalent was for, say, *tu*. They found that in English the word was *■u*. Other words changed, but not due to the influence of French or Latin. *Heaven* (*heofunum*) is an example. *Earth* (*eor=an*) is another.

After the conquest, three letters actually dropped from the alphabet, *thorn* (*■*), *eth* (*Ɀ*), and *wynn* (*Ww*). (Millward, 1996) The sounds of these first two letters are based on various pronunciations of the *th* sound. This sound does not occur in French. (Dubois, 1954) Therefore, it can be assumed that the loss of these two letters is the result of the French influences. The third letter produced a *w* sound. It does not occur in the text of the *Lord's Prayer* (*Lord's Prayer*, c. 900) and will be addressed in its own section.

Amazingly, one letter was actually added to the English alphabet after the conquest that is not around today. This letter is *yogh* (*Hh*). It occurs in the Middle English texts of the *Lord's prayer* (Paues, 1904) and will also be dealt with separately.

One of the most interesting changes that has occurred in English since the tenth century, is that of the pronouns. In the Old English the proper form of the nominative second person singular personal pronoun was *■u* (Millward, 1996), p 100. (Sweet, 1963). Today, the proper form is *you* (Thompson, 1995). There is, in fact, a fairly complex process by which this change took place, and it appears to be indicative of changes to other English words. This pronoun is the primary focus of this paper. It shall be used as an example of how the English language, and indeed all languages, changes over time.

French and Latin obviously had a profound impact on the development of the English language. It was the Norman Conquest that brought the contact between these three languages. Directly, by bringing a French speaking people into domination over the English, and indirectly by causing the Old English to fall out of use and for the learned of the Church to have to use that Latin to replace holes in this broken language.

One of the best tools for examining the evolution of English from the tenth century to the present is the Lord's Prayer. The Lord's Prayer has been translated into English numerous times at numerous points in history and is therefore useful as a marker for the changes over time.

This is all very well, but it is not enough to simply say that language has evolved, or even to say that English has evolved. In order to prove that such an evolution has taken place a mechanism for this evolution must be established. One very likely possibility is that language breeds in much the same manner as animals do. Although one language will not quickly become a totally different language, it can change drastically over a period of time, to a point that the two forms are almost totally dissimilar. Therefore, through contact with other languages and through subsequent isolation from them, one language can evolve into another. Although this change is certainly present in almost every language on Earth, it is most evident in English and thus English is the primary focus of this paper.

Language Evolves

In order to further explore the evolution of English, one must first explore the evolution of language in general. Linguists are almost totally in agreement about the fact that Language does evolve. The question, however, remains, how does it evolve?

Long has been the debate about the implications of the human construction of Language. Does language evolve? Most linguists would agree that it does. This evolution can not rightly be called Natural Selection, however. It is very much like natural selection, however. There is one key difference, there is no combining of genes and traits through a, at least quasi-random, process, reproduction. Words do not breed individually, rather the language as a whole breeds with another language and produces a new variety of language. This evolution is the result of a kind of breeding, the mixing of languages in to new dialects, or varieties, and eventually into totally new languages. Thus, the term breeding shall be substituted for natural selection in order to better differentiate the two concepts, which though similar are not synonymous. Language will survive even if it never comes into contact with another language and breeds. This is Darwinian evolution, even if it is not natural selection per se.

In 1859 Charles Darwin published *The Origin of Species* (Darwin, 1958). This work attempted to explain how Darwin had seen that animals had evolved into different species, by means of a process that he called natural selection. Simply put, natural selection is the process by which specific traits, which are beneficial to the organism are selected for because the individuals with that specific trait are better able to live and reproduce, thus passing the trait on to the subsequent generation. This idea, with some modification, is now accepted almost universally in the scientific community.

Therefore, what is to say that it must be limited to biological evolution? What would happen if this same principle were overlaid upon linguistics? If one focuses upon the languages immediately related to English, in this case the Indo-European languages then a close connection becomes obvious. There are several words other than you that bear the most striking similarities in the Indo-European languages. These words are, mother, three, and, I/me. Each of these words shall be examined in subsequent paragraphs and compared from the languages of Modern English, Old English, German, French, Latin, Koine Greek, Russian, Czech, Albanian, and Danish. These languages should provide an adequate variety.

Probably, the most constant from language to language, is the word mother. In Modern English's closest relative, German, the equivalent word is *mater*. (Sasse, 1966) Notice, that the initial consonant does not change at all, nor does the final one. The consonant sounds (t) and (th) are very closely related. The vowel of the second syllable is unchanging. This leaves only one change in the entire spelling of the word, that being the vowel of the first syllable, which changes from (a) to (o). There is, actually, a perfectly good explanation for this. In Biblical Hebrew, the vowel sounds (a) and (o) are represented by the same symbol, ("). (Kelly, 1992) The fact that no difference was even perceived by the ancient Hebrews, or even by the more recent Mazarettes (who gave the Biblical text vowel points), indicates that these two letters and sounds are fundamentally similar and mistakable. This explains the vowel of the first syllable.

Although German is the mother of English, French has probably had more impact, at least on vocabulary. The French equivalent of mother is *mère* (Dubois, 1954). At first glance, *mère* appears to be radically different. However, the two words still bear striking similarities. The first and last consonants remain the same, and the vowel sounds are simply contracted into the *è*. Thus, the only real change is the loss of the middle consonant, but nevertheless, a similarity exists.

The mother tongue of French is Latin. In Latin, the nominative singular form of mother is *mater* (Ullman, 1936). This word is spelled identically to the German. Thus, the same comparison applies here. What, therefore, becomes interesting is that two languages, which are not even in the same sub family, have exactly the same word for exactly the same concept. This in itself is a strong piece of evidence for a single, Proto-Indo European, mother language.

One of the oldest languages in Europe is, Greek, in this case, Koine Greek. In the Koine the equivalent, of mother is *mhvth* (Louw, 1989). This is essentially the same word as its Latin counterpart, with but one exception, the (a) of the initial syllable has been lengthened to (h). This is very similar to what happens to the first syllable in the French, it becomes an (e).

Russian, is only very distantly related to English, however, the similarities are still astounding. In Russian, mother is *vmam*, (Wheeler, 1992)

or in transliteration, *mat*. Notice that the first syllable of the Latin form is intact, the second has simply been dropped.

At this point, it is obvious that at least one syllable of *mother*, that being *mat*, comes almost directly from the Proto-Indo-European roots. In the Western Slavic Language, Czech, the word is *matka* (Poldauf, 1998) The initial syllable remains unchanged. Therefore, it becomes increasingly obvious that *mat* has ancient roots.

Probably, the least related language discussed in this paper is Albanian. Although, the similarities to other Indo-European languages are still present. The word for mother is *mōmō* (Newmark, 1999). This word appears to have undergone the same process as the French *mΦre*. The (a) and the (e) have both been shortened to (ō). Mother is thus a very strong example of linguistic evolution.

Another, very strong example of linguistic evolution is the word *three*. It exhibits virtually no change throughout the Indo-European languages. In the German, the equivalent is *drei*. (Sasse, 1966) Here, on the surface, there appears to have been much change, however, in reality there has been very little. First of all, of course, since German does not have the (th) sound, something else must take its place, in this case it is the (d) sound. The only other change is in the final vowel, from (e) to (i). This change is only on the surface, since (e) and (i) are considered to be in the same class of vowels. Another Germanic language that has had a significant impact upon the linguistic development of English, is Danish. In the late 8th century, the Danes attacked northern Britain. From this point until about the time of the Norman Conquest, the Danes would be a presence in the north (Hollister, 1996). During these nearly three hundred years, the Danish tongue did have some impact upon English development, although all of the effects that it had are not yet known. The Danish equivalent of *three* is *tre*. (Allan, 1998) The only major difference between this and the English, is the replacement of (th) with (t), and the dropping of the second, and in this instance unnecessary, vowel. Otherwise, the two are identical.

French, on the other hand, shows marked change. In French the word for the English *three* is *trois* (Dubois, 1954). The initial consonant changes for the same reason as the German, to replace the (th). The French then, changes (ee) to (oi), a diphthong that retains the original sound in the second sound, while producing a new initial sound. This, at least to a certain extent, explains the vowel shift. The addition of (s), however, presents a problem that will be discussed in the following paragraph.

In French's predecessor language, Latin, the word is *tres* (Ullman, 1936). The basic form *tre* is the same as in German and French, as well as, with the alteration of (t) to (th), English. The addition of the (s) is due to the fact that in most cases *tres* acts as an adjective, and the proper masculine singular adjectival ending, for first and second declension adjectives is, -us (Ullman, 1936).

The Koine Greek word for three is *trei*" (Louw, 1989). This word is spelled exactly the same way as in the Latin. Therefore, the differences are also exactly the same. However, two languages with exactly the same form indicates, very strongly, that language has evolved from an earlier form. In the Eastern Slavic Language, Russian, the proper form of three is *nhb* (Wheeler, 1992) or, transliterated, *tri*. Considering that (i) and (e) are closely related sounds, this is exactly the same form as the Danish, and possibly constitutes the original root form.

In the Western Slavic Language, Czech, the equivalent form is *tri* (Poldauf, 1998). The form is exactly identical to the Russian and Danish. This provides even further evidence that this form is, in fact the probable root form.

In the Albanian, the proper form is *tre* (Poldauf, 1998). Once again, almost identical to the others. Thus, it requires no further explanation.

The first person singular personal pronoun, also has a great deal of similarity from language to language, at least within the Indo-European family. In Modern English, this takes the form of *I* in the subjective² case, and *me* in the objective³ case form. In the German, these take the form of *Ich* in the nominative, and *mich* in the accusative (Poldauf, 1998). Bridging the gap is Old English, in which the proper forms are *ic* and *me/mec* respectively (Millward, 1996). The Old English and the Modern English are remarkably similar, the Modern English simply drops the (c) from the end of the forms. Also, the Modern English has capitalized the subjective singular form. In terms of the German, the capitalization has been retained, in addition (h) has been added to soften the consonantal sound. In the accusative, the (e) has become (i), in addition to the softening by means of (h).

The Danish first person pronouns are *jeg* in the subjective case, and *mig* in the objective (Allan, 1998). In order to properly demonstrate the relationship between, *jeg* and *I*, an exploration into the name John may be in order. In the Greek text of the New Testament, the name John, in the nominative singular form, is spelled, *ἰωάννης*". (Aland, 1998) Notice that the initial letter is an (i) not a (j). The Greek alphabet has no (j) (Cranford, 1999), nor does the Latin (Ullman, 1936). In the Latin the name John is spelled *Iohannes* (Fischer, 1994). Once again, there is an (i) instead of a (j). Since, (j) and (i) are, quite obviously, intimately related, it is not surprising that the two would be used interchangeably in this instance. The (g) as the final consonant, is also not very different, at least from the German, *Ich*. Both the sounds, (ch) and (g) are considered to be gutturals, sounds made from the back of the mouth and in the throat, and are, therefore, closely related.

The accusative form, *meg*, in the Danish shows very little change from the German. It has simply, a shift from (i) to (e), and from (ch) to (g). Therefore, no other commentary is necessary.

In the language from which nearly 60% of all English words are derived, French, the first person personal pronouns are, *je* in the nominative, and *me* in the accusative. (Dubois, 1954) The nominative form simply divides (i) into the consonant (j) and the related vowel (e). The accusative is exactly the same as the Modern English.

The Latin forms are *ego* in the nominative, and *me* in the accusative (Ullman, 1936). The initial vowel has simply shifted from (i) to the closely related (e). The consonant, (j/g) sound is retained. Also the (o) is added as an inflectional ending. The accusative, *me* is exactly the same as in French and English.

The accusative form of the pronoun retains virtually the same form through out the Romance and Germanic languages examined here, *me* is a probable root form for these two language groups.

The Slavic Language sub-family presents a new twist. The Western Slavic, Russian has the nominative form, *Я*, and the accusative form, *вѣз* (Wheeler, 1992). The *Я* would be transliterated, *ya*. When transliterated, the similarity becomes more apparent. Here the closest comparative reference would be French. Considering that in many languages, (j) is pronounced as (y). This leaves only the vowel, which can be explained by isolation after contact⁴. *Вѣз* presents a different problem. It has the same root form as the other languages, but has the addition of the (nya) sound at the end. This is simply an inflectional ending, and thus this seemingly insurmountable explanation has been accomplished.

The Czech form is *já* (Short, 1994) (pronounced *ya*) there is no significant difference between the Czech and Russian, and thus no need for further explanation. The accusative form is *mne* (Short, 1994). This form also bears a substantial similarity to the Russian and also does not require any further explanation.

The Koine Greek has the nominative form, *ἐγώ* (Arndt, 1979). This form is transliterated the same as the Latin, and follows the same comparative explanations. The accusative has two possible spellings, *ἐμεν* and *μεν* (Cranford, 1999). The latter form is transliterated the same as the Latin. The former, however, adds the (ej) to the beginning. This is a definite part of the Greek first person pronominal form, being the older of the two, may be a derelict from a more archaic form of this pronoun. It is not, however, pertinent to this discussion.

Finally, comes Albanian. The Albanian is quite unique in this respect. The nominative singular form of the first person pronoun is *unë* (Newmark, 1999) This bears a very striking resemblance, not to *I*, but to the French/Latin form of one which is, in the Latin *una* (Ullman, 1936) and in the French, *un/une* (Dubois, 1954). This may elude to an extremely ancient form of the pronoun, but it is not relevant to this discussion.

The accusative form, on the other hand, is quite similar to the other Indo-European forms. In Albanian, this form is *mu'a* (Newmark, 1999). Notice the

(m) as the initial consonant. That is the basic extent of Albanian first person pronominal similarity.

The Breeding

Language evolves. It evolves by means of certain mechanisms. First, it evolves by isolation and continued manipulation during generation after generation. Second, it evolves by contact and breeding between two entirely distinct languages, thus produces at least one if not more new languages or language families. And third, by metaphoric comparison and imitation by which a word can come to have a new meaning, totally separate from its prior ones.

Another key issue in the field of linguistics, and the one that this paper deals with, is the issue of thought and its implications upon language. Is language necessary to thought or is thought necessary to language.

According to Philip Lieberman, language is very much necessary to thought. This conclusion is based, in part on a study involving an expedition up Mount Everest in Nepal. The study found that the higher the altitude and the harsher the conditions, the longer the time needed for the climbers to comprehend simple sentence structure. The same amount of time was required to articulate simple ideas. By 24,000 feet their speech and comprehension abilities had been reduced by fifty percent. Lieberman uses these findings, especially the comprehension portion, to support his conclusions. He maintains that this indicates that man cannot think without the use of words (Lieberman, 1998).

Linguist Steven Pinker holds the opposite opinion. He uses the following example from George Orwell's 1984. One must first remember the new language created by Orwell called Newspeak. Newspeak has no words for freedom or liberty (Orwell, 1949). Pinker maintains, however, that the idea still exists. One can still imagine what it is like to be free, even if there is no word for such a concept. Though 1984 is a work of fiction, this idea can be extended into the real world of thought and language.

This paper is on the side of Pinker. If one examines the evidence in favor of linguistic evolution, one can clearly see that different words mean the same thing in different languages. This seems an obvious thing to say, however, the implications of this are far reaching into the thought versus language field. If for example, the word *Atets*, in Russian means father. The French equivalent is *père*. These two words are from two entirely different languages from two very different language families. Since these two families have developed different words for the same concept then that concept cannot be dependent upon the word in the language (Pinker, 1994).

Then there is the homophone example. The English word *chair* refers to a small platform with a back intended for sitting. In French the word *cher* sound almost exactly the same, but it means something totally different, this

word is used as the greeting in a written correspondence. Thus, again, if language was necessary for thought then occurrences such as this would not occur.

So, then, if language is dependent on thought then one can logically assume that language evolved after thought. One can also assume that any creature that possesses a language is capable of thought. Bees wiggling to direct their comrades toward a new food source could be considered a language. Or whales singing to each other could be considered a language. (Bickerton, 1990)

Now, no one will dispute that these are all forms of communication. Language, though, is more than simply a form of communication. Language could be said to be a form of communication that has the purpose of transmitting more than just simple data or facts. A language can communicate ideas and abstract concepts. A bee's dancing communicates only three things, direction, distance, and quantity of a food source. There do not appear to be structures in this form of communicating the bee's interpretation of literary works, or of pondering upon the meaning of existence. A human being can communicate such abstract ideas, no matter what language said human speaks. The human also does not need a common frame of reference in order to properly express such abstractions as, "I think therefore I am," or "I love you." Or rather the human does not require physical frames of reference. The word "think" itself in English is a frame of reference as is "love." Yet these are abstract concepts. There is no constant image that occurs to the recipient of this transmission. The bee cannot express these concepts in its dance-language.

There still remains the problem of the whales. Their form of communication is most certainly different from that of man. But, how? The answer is really quite simple, grammar. Human languages all have a specific grammatical structure. This structure is constant and inalterable throughout that language. No distinctive and repeated sounds or symbols have been detected in the whale songs. In German, for example there exists a rule that in a statement the verb is always in second position. This rule does not change, ever. English, French, and Russian's rules are not nearly so strict but they do exist, nonetheless. Thus, given this, a language must also have certain distinct "words." Words being simply symbols or groups of symbols which have a constant meaning in a given context. Whale song does not appear to have these (this is not to say that such constructions will never be found just that they have not been yet). Therefore, under this definition of language, neither the bee dances nor the whale songs would fit, as we know them to today. Human language does, however, fit the definition. It is simply, a form of communication that uses constant grammatical constructions and words to convey not merely facts and data but ideas and abstract concepts. That is language.

Given the similarities there can be little doubt that our modern languages evolved from these seemingly lower forms of communication. At this point the evolution of language parallels the evolution of man. At the point when man, as he is known today, first used language, this evolution split. There is much evidence to support the theory that all of mankind's languages evolved from a single source, a single language. In his book, *The Origin of Language*, Merritt Ruhlen follows this evolution back from the modern languages of man all the way back to one "Proto-language". (Ruhlen, 1994). p 106. The first comparison that he makes is between the Indo-European languages. In his comparison of European languages, Ruhlen compares, Arabic, Hebrew, Sanskrit, Avestan, Classical Greek, Latin, Gothic, Old Irish, and Turkish. He discovers many striking similarities between these languages, especially with such words as two, three, me, you, mother, and others.

Ruhlen then continues and makes the same comparisons of African, Asian and Native Americans. He derives from these comparisons several large language families in each region. He then similarly compares these language families, and using different words comes to similar conclusions about the relationships of these families. After much comparison and analysis he breaks all of the world's languages down into twelve distinct language families. Upon this segregation of families, Ruhlen proceeds to compare these language groups and to arrive at the conclusion that all of these major families are related and therefore must have come from one source. With that he has proven that language evolves. (Ruhlen, 1994) Now, thanks to Ruhlen, one can see that language evolves. The question now moves to how. How does language evolve? Is it by means of natural selection? Do languages actually get selected for or against genetically? Certainly not. However, many of the mechanisms by which natural selection is carried out do apply in this instance. Here is an example, a band of people who are a clan or extended family and therefore share many speech and linguistic patterns. Certain words are also in their vocabularies that may not be in the vocabularies of other genetically similar groups. Their speech patterns will also corrupt the actual pronunciations. If this clan were for some reason isolated and forced to form their own settlement and consequently, eventually, their own civilization. The pronunciation differences will remain in the vocabularies of the citizens of this civilization. These corruptions will be furthered by subsequent generations until a totally new dialect has developed. Then, given enough vocabulary differences and enough generations, this dialect may change into a totally new language. This language will share many of the characteristics of its mother tongue (especially grammar); thus the two will remain related though they will not actually be the same. This scenario is an example of one of the probable mechanisms for the evolution of language.

A second mechanism for such evolution is something that I shall term breeding. Breeding when applied to linguistics refers to the mixing which occurs when two people groups who speak two different languages come in contact in an enclosed environment. These peoples will begin to intermarry before too many generations have passed (whether this intermarriage is by necessity or by choice truly is irrelevant to this discussion). When this happens the two parts of a couple will speak two different languages. The offspring of this union will thus grow up bilingual. As these children begin to incorporate elements from language into sentences of the other, these words will be introduced into his vocabulary in that language. He will then pass these new words on to his children, who, in turn, will do the same thing that he did to their language, and so on, and so on until the languages have merged into a third language.

As this language begins to evolve in other ways it will eventually become more than just the some of its two parts. English is an excellent example of this. English began as a Germanic tongue, but when the Angles had extended contact with the Normans and other French tribes. The breeding began. Modern English, though, is more than simply a mix of French and German. It has grown via isolation and other methods into what it is now.

English remains the ultimate example of linguistic evolution. A new Dictionary edition can hardly have less than twenty new words each time it is printed. Such colloquialisms as "neat", "rad", "cool", and "dude" have changed their meanings in recent decades and have thus found their way into the common speech such that even a highly educated person will often not hesitate to say that something is "cool" or "neat." This is the third way in which language evolves. At one point, one person makes a metaphoric comparison. The people he is with take to using this expression, as do the people they come in contact with and so on. The modern era of mass media leads this mechanism down a new and faster route. If a character in a motion picture or television show uses a phrase like the one listed above, then a much larger portion of the population hears it when it is first uttered. Then these people use this phrase in the presence of others and so on. A good example would be that of Star Trek's "Beam me up, Scottie." Though this popular phrase was never actually used in the show, similar ones were. The viewers of this television show then began to use this phrase to express a desire to be removed from a situation in order to convey that said situation makes them uncomfortable. Then later television and movie characters began to use this same expression. And, even though it is not yet in the dictionary, it is definitely part of American language. This is Linguistic evolution in action.

This evolution apparently occurred in conjunction with the migrations of modern man out of Africa. If one overlays a linguistic map of North and South America (Ruhlen, 1994) and a genotype one of the same area (Cavalli-

Sforza, 1995) one can determine that the locations of the Arawakan and Uto-Aztec Language groups correspond to the location of certain gene and blood types. This, among other things has led Cavalli-Sforza and his team to the conclusion that there were two separate migrations from Siberia to the Americas. If this occurred then for a time the first and second groups would be isolated, leading to the first mechanism for linguistic evolution. Then, once the second migration had begun, the two would meet and breed and thus create the middle, hybrid languages. All three of these groups would then continue to evolve using the three mechanisms described above, until, eventually they become three or four distinct language families. These families contain many related languages. And these languages contain some related dialects. Thus language evolves from one to many, from simple to complex.

At this point it may be prudent to discuss the possible outcomes of linguistic breeding. There are three possible offspring of two languages combined, dialect, pigin/creole, and language. A dialect is simply a branch of a language that possesses some variation in vocabulary and pronunciation (i.e. SAE, Standard American English and BEV, Black English Vernacular), but does not have any substantial grammatical difference. A new dialect is formed by linguistic breeding in one specific region where a language is spoken, and/or subsequent isolation of that region, (i.e. the American colonies). A pigin is a spoken form of communication, which uses combined vocabulary, but has no real grammatical structure. A creole often develops out of a pigin. It has a simple conglomerated vocabulary, but possesses a true grammar. These two forms develop in short term combination environments, often where there are many different languages used by adults who have already acquired a grammatical structure and therefore cannot change that structure without substantial effort. A creole is the language spoken by the children of pigin speakers. These children then overlay a grammatical structure over their parents combined vocabulary. The pigin/creole complex often arises in immigrant worker scenarios.

A language develops when there is a long-term contact between two languages, followed by an extended period of isolation in which the languages can continue to develop along a natural, independent route. It is this breeding of language that shall be the focal point of the remainder of this paper. Specifically, the breeding of English with both French and Latin shall be addressed here. If it had not been for the encounters and subsequent breeding of these three languages in 1066, English would be a very different language. It is still classified as a Germanic Language, but that is primarily in form, the vocabulary has been heavily romanized by the simultaneous impacts of French and Latin.

Probably, one of, if not the best example of this change due to Romantic influences, is the second person singular personal pronoun, *you* in Modern English (Thompson, 1995). The Modern English form shows marked

difference from any of the other Indo-European languages discussed here. The Old English, however, does not show such marked change. The form in the nominative case was *þu* (Millward, 1996). As was stated earlier, the "Lord's Prayer" (NOAB, 1991) found in the "Gospel of Matthew" (NOAB, 1991) is an excellent reference for linguistic comparative analysis. It is an old text that was very important to the Christian Church since its founding, therefore, it is a text that can be found in many languages, with almost the same text, merely translated into the local vernacular. The other advantage to using the "Lord's Prayer" is that there exists a version in the original Koine Greek (Aland, 1998). This version can then be used for comparison to the newer translations.

A final advantage to using the text of the "Lord's Prayer" is that it contains the singular form of the second person personal pronoun in every language. The presence of you and its equivalents provides a simple way to compare the forms.

As a backdrop to the following analysis of the evolution of you in the "Lord's Prayer," it will probably prove helpful to do a comparative analysis of the other Indo-European texts of the same document, beginning with the original Greek.

In the Greek text, in Matthew 6:9, the genitive singular form appears, *sou*. (Aland, 1998) Not how similar the form is to the English, you. The vowel diphthong is exactly the same. The consonant, however presents a problem. The (y) sound and the (s) sound have no direct correlation. The English form, however, has undergone nearly a millennium of change to get to its present point. The reasons for this change shall be discussed in later sections.

In the Latin Vulgate, the form in the same verse is *tuum* (Fischer, 1994). The changes here are two. First, the initial consonant has inexplicably changed to (t). Other than this, the only change is the addition of the Latin masculine singular genitive ending *s*. The (u) root remains the same. The Latin use of (t) will become the norm in all of the other languages discussed here.

The French form found in the Matthew text is *ta*. (, 1999) The vowel shifts to (a), but this is not the case in the nominative form, which will be discussed later in this section. Otherwise, the French and Latin forms are the same.

In the German text of the Lord's Prayer, the forms used are *Du* in the nominative and *Dein* in the possessive (Kirchenbuch, 1908). The form to be focused upon here is *du*. The change from the French and Latin is quite simple. The initial consonant has shifted from (t) to the closely related (d). This change is simple enough.

The Eastern Slavic language, Russian, has this form translated, *Ndjt* (, 1992). Once again the (t) sound is retained, while the inflected ending is shifted to the genitive. This still is remarkably similar to the Latin and

German versions, although the similarity to the Greek cannot be seen with the genitive form. At this point, it may be possible to say that a possible Indo-European root, would be *tu* since these elements appear in virtually all of the languages discussed here.

In the Czech version of Matthew, the word *sou* is translated *tv* (, 1991). This form is virtually the same as the Russian except that it drops out the (o) sound. The nominative forms will be discussed and compared in a subsequent section.

The Albanian translation of the Lord's Prayer uses the form *te* (Newmark, 1999). This is the ablative case form in the Albanian, which takes on the use of possession (Newmark, 1982). The form is somewhat similar to the others, although the vowel is only the same as in the Russian and in the Czech, to which Albanian is not directly related. The consonant remains constant.

The Old English form has *sou* translated by the nominative form *■u* and by the genitive, *■in* (Lord's Prayer, c. 900). It is note worthy that both the German and the Old English translate these verses using both the nominative and the genitive forms. The Old English replaces the (t) sound in the initial consonant with its own (th), which it and Greek alone of all the languages discussed here have a letter for. The (■) is very closely related to the (t) sound, thus Old English remains very similar to its predecessors. Also, as with other languages, the vowel changes based upon the case form, and thus cannot properly discussed without the use of a common case form.

In the Middle English, however, there has been a change in the form of the translation of the pronoun. The form here is the possessive form of the pronoun, *■i* (Paues, 1904). The possessive pronoun grows up out of the old genitive case form, and it is a result of the lessening of inflection (Millward, 1996). The initial consonant remains the same, and the only other change is the loss of the final consonant (n). Although the (n) is retained in one form of the possessive (Millward, 1996).

In the previous paragraphs, the forms of the second person singular personal found in the Lord's Prayer have been compared. There is, however, a problem with this comparison, which is that these forms are not all in the same case form. In order to better compare this pronoun, it may be helpful to simply examine the nominative singular forms in each of these languages. The forms of these eleven languages are as follows, *suv*, *tu*, *tu*, *du*, *du*, *ns*, *ty*, *ti*, *■u*, *■u*, *you*. These languages are, in order, Greek (Cranford, 1999), Latin (Ullman, 1936), French (Dubois, 1954), German (Moeller, 1996), Danish (Allan, 1998), Russian (Kostomarov, 1992), Czech (Short, 1994), Albanian (Newmark, 1982), Old English (Mitchell, 1988), (Millward, 1996), Middle English (Millward, 1996), and Modern English (Thompson, 1995). There is very little difference between these eleven forms. In fact, there are only three major alterations. First, the Greek has an (s) as its initial consonant, whereas the majority of other languages have a (t). Second, the Russian, Czech, and

Albanian have an (i) sound where the others have a (u). And third, the Modern English has a (y) as its initial consonant instead of the more common (t). Since the focus of this paper is on the development of English, the Modern English difference shall be considered, and the other two differences, for the purposes of this paper, shall simply be ignored.

Now that the backdrop for English pronominal change has been established, the question becomes, what causes the English second person singular personal pronoun to change, in the nominative form, from *þu* to *you* in the space of less than 1100 years. There is actually, as was said earlier, only one major change in the form that is from (þ) to (y) in the initial consonant. This is, of course, not the only change in the language over this period, it is merely one of the better examples, as well as one of the easiest to grab hold of.

There is one major explanation for the change of the pronoun that is breeding with other languages, specifically, French and Latin. As virtually anyone who has had any exposure to British history knows, in 1066, England was invaded by William, Duke of Normandy. What followed was over four hundred years of oppression of all things English. The French speaking Normans dominated political life, and the Latin speaking church ruled over religion. This left English as the language only of the peasant classes for all of this time. Over this period many words, which were not often, if ever, used in every day speech dropped out. By the time Henry V came to the throne in the early fifteenth century, and began to view himself as English (Green, 1891), the English language had fallen into disrepair. Much of the vocabulary necessary for commerce, politics, and religion had long since been lost. These words must then be replaced. When scholars would write in English, they would quickly come across a word for which English had no synonym. An excellent example of this would be the Modern English word *debt*. The Old English form had been *gyltas* (Lord's Prayer, c. 900), however, this word had primarily dropped out of the vernacular by the time of Henry V, therefore, it was replaced by the Latin equivalent, *debitus* (Fischer, 1994). The form was then contracted through usage to simply *debt* (NOAB, 1991). This is how linguistic breeding works. One language comes into contact with another, some vocabulary and grammar are shared, each one then goes on separately and the vocabulary and grammar adapt and change based upon their use, until they become a unique form which is neither of the original combined languages, but rather an entirely new entity.

There is one other consequence of this breeding, that is the loss of inflection. This is actually not a direct result of contact with either Latin or French, it is rather a result of the use of English only by the commoners for four hundred years. This resulted in a lack of grammatical rules and writings, English lost its inflection, simply because it was simpler, at that time, to retain only one, in the case of nouns or two, in the case of pronouns, forms.

There were very few, if any scholars of English to retain this inflection, as there were with ancient Greek and Latin.

It is the loss of inflection that directly affects the second person pronoun. In 900 AD, the singular form had four inflectional forms (Millward, 1996), two of which are found in the text of the Lord's Prayer, *■u* and *■in* (Lord's Prayer, c. 900) whereas in 2000 AD, it has but one, *you* (Thompson, 1995). This is most probably a result of this process of linguistic simplification as a result of isolation. *You*, however, is not the result of replacement by a foreign word, rather it is the result of a combination of two language forms of the same word, in this case, *■u*, English, and, *tu*, French/Latin. One might question, and legitimately so, how (th) and (t) can merge to become (y). The answer is, through isolation.

At this point something else must be thrown into the fray, the plural forms. At this point in the evolution, these forms play an integral part in the development. The Old English nominative plural form is *ge* while the French equivalent is *vous*. In the Middle English, the form shifts to *he* or *ye* (Millward, 1996). The letter *h* is a combination of (g) and (y) sounds. This seems like quite a jump from (g) to (gy) or (y). In reality it is not. If one remembers that the French presence in Britain is very strong at this point, then this shift becomes markedly easier to explain. The question becomes, what happens when the (g) and (v) sounds combine into a single consonant sound. The resulting sound is a (gv), which could easily shift, in an isolation scenario, to a (gy) sound.

This is one possibility for how this form came to be. Another, is that the (g) sound naturally changes into the (gy) sound and then into the (y) sound as a result of linguistic isolation. This does not negate the use of the mechanisms of natural selection in the evolution of the second person singular personal pronoun, but rather give it two possibilities for a route to have taken.

This is all well and good, but how does this change in the plural form affect the singular form, which even in the Middle English has lost inflection, but has not changed in spelling or pronunciation. It is still *■u* (Millward, 1996). The answer, once again is consolidation due to use in isolation. In isolation, the tendency is for consolidation and contraction of words and forms (i.e. *debitus* becomes *debt*, etc.).

In English, in the centuries following Henry V, the language existed in virtual isolation. By this is not meant that there was no contact with other languages, on the contrary this was a period of great expansion in trade and exploration, but there is not a lasting presence of another language group. English still has its centuries of contact with French and Latin in its past, but they are no longer an influence, thus the borrowings and conglomerations formed through contact with these languages become skewed through use. It is in this period of simplification and combination that the second person pronoun makes its final shift. In this period for reasons which may never be fully explained the singular and plural forms combine to form the single

form, which can be used for both forms. This is a simplification process in which one form is selected over another for usefulness. The single form you is much more practical at this point in the development of English than are the two forms **■**u and he. This is Natural Selection, or breeding of languages in actuality. Three languages have come into contact, one was then cut off from the other two and thus developed along its own, separate, course. Just as Darwin's finches emerged through specialization in isolation, so then did English specialize to its environment in its essential isolation.

Language evolves. Until this point, most comparative linguists have been content to leave it at that. The bulk of evolutionary linguistic literature has been devoted either to why and how humans developed language in the first place, or simply demonstrating that languages evolves at all. With this much established, now is the time to begin an investigation of how languages themselves evolve over time. Succinctly they evolve through two major mechanisms. First through contact with other languages, and second through subsequent isolation from other languages. This can be seen most profoundly in the development of English. English has had a very distinct and unique developmental history. This makes it a prime specimen for examination of the mechanisms by which languages evolve and change over time.

Natural Selection was first proposed by Charles Darwin. It seems only logical to apply the principals that Darwin saw in the biological realm to languages. Though there a number of differences between Darwinian Natural Selection and the linguistic evolutionary mechanisms proposed here, these are not of great significance and warrant only a name change to breeding from Natural Selection. This work only scratches the surface of an emerging field which still requires a great deal of research in order to truly explain linguistic evolution.

Appendix A:

The Lord's Prayer

The Lord's Prayer in Greek

Pavter hJmw'n oJ ejn toi'" oujranoi'"

ajgiasqhvtw to; ojvnomav sou

ejlqevtw hJ basileiva sou

genhqhvtw to; qevlhmv sou,

wJ" ejn oujranw/" kai; ejpi; gh'"

to;n ajvrton hJmw'n to;n ejpiouvSION do;" hJmi'n shvmeron

kai; ajvfe" hJmi'n ta; ojfeilhvmata hJmw'n

wJ" kai; hJmei'" ajfnvkamen toi'" ojfeilevtai" hJmw'n

kai; mh; eijsenevgkh/" hJma'" ej" peirasmovn,

ajlla; rJu'sai hJma'" ajpo; tou' ponhpou'.

Latin

Pater noster qui in caelis es
 sanctificetur nomen tuum.
 veniat regnum tuum fiat voluntas
 tua sicut in caelo et in terra.
 panem nostrum supersubstantialem
 da nobis hodie.
 et dimitte nobis debita nostra sicut
 et nos dimisimus debitoribus nostris.
 et ne inducas in temptationem se libera
 nos a malo.

French

Notre Père qui es aux cieux!
 Que ton nom soit sanctifié.
 Que ton règne vienne;
 Que ta volonté soit faite sur la terre
 comme au ciel.
 Donne-nous aujourd'hui notre pain
 quotidien,
 Pardonne-nous nos offenses comme
 nous pardonnons aussi à ceux qui nous
 ont offensés.
 Ne nous laisse pas entrer dans la tentation,
 mais délivre-nous du Malin.

German

Vater unser, der Du bist im Himmel.
 Geheiligt werde Dein Name.
 Dein Reich komme. Dein Wille geschehe,
 wie im Himmel, also auch auf Erden.
 Unser täglich Brot gib uns heute.
 Und vergieb uns unsere Schuld,
 als wir vergeben unsern Schuldigern.
 Und führe uns nicht in Versuchung;
 Sondern erlöse uns von dem Bösen.
 Denn Dein ist das Reich und die
 Kraft und die Herrlichkeit in Ewigkeit.
 Amen.

Old English

Fæder ure,
 Thū ðe eart on heofunum,
si ðin nam gehalgod.
Tobecume ðin rice.
Gewurðe ðin willa
on eorðan swa swa in heofunum.
Urne gedrihten hlafe syle
us to drihten.
And forgyf us ure gyltas, swa swa
we forgyfað urum gyltendum.
And ne gelæddu us costununge,
ac alys us of yfele. Soðlice.

Middle English

Fader, halewid be thi name,
This kyngdom com to.
Hue to vs to dai oure ech daies breed.
And forhue to vs oure synnes,
as we forhuen ech man that owith us to vs.
And lede us not in to temtacioun

Modern English

Our Father in heaven,
hallowed be your name.
Your kingdom come.
Your will be done,
on earth as it is in heaven.
Give us this day our daily bread.
And forgive us our debts,
as we have forgiven our debtors.
And do not bring us to the time of trial,
but deliver us from the evil one.

Russian

Jnxt bfi- ceobq yf yt,tcf[@
lf cdznbncz bvz Ndj+ lf ghb_
bltn Wfhcndbt Ndj+ lf ,eltn dj_
kz Ndjz b yf pvtkt- rfr yf yt_
,t+ [kt, yfi yfceoysq lfq
yfv yf ctq ltym+ b ghjcnb yfv

lj kub y fib- r fr b vs ghjoftv
 ljk;ybrfv y fibv+ b yt ddtlb
 yfc d bcreitybt- yj bp,fdm yfc
 jn kerfdjuj= B,j Ndj tcnm Wfh_
 cndj b cbkf b ckfdf dj dtrb=
 Fvbym=

Czech

Otce náš, kter²z jsi v nebes^och,
 posvet se jm^ono tv^o.
 Prid kr^olovstv^o tv^o. Bud
 vule tv^o jako v nebi tak i na zemi.
 Chl^ob náš vezdej^o dej nám dnes
 A odpust nám viny naše,
 jakoz i my odpou^ome vinn^o-
 kum našim.
 I neuvod nás v poku^oen^o,
 ale zbav nás od zl^oho. Nebo
 tv^o jest kr^olovstv^o, i moc,
 i sl^ova, na veky, AMEN

Albanian

Ati, yne qe je ne qiell,
 te nderofshin te gjithe ngerezit.
 Ardhte mbreteria jote -
 u befte vullneti yt se ne qiell,
 ashtu edhe ne toke.
 Buken tone te perditshme na e jep sot.
 na i fal fajet tona,
 sic ua falem ne fajtove tane.
 E mos lejo te biem na tundim,
 por na shpeto nga i Ligu.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- "Lord's Prayer in Albanian." : http://incolor.inetnebr.com/stuart/lp_alb.htm.
 La Bible: Ancien et Nouveau Testaments. Toronto: Societe Biblique Canadien, 1987.
 New Oxford Annotated Bible, New Revised Standard Version. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
 Bible Svata: Ceska Biblicka Spolecnost, 1991.
 Bibliya. Moscow: Izdanie Moskovskoy Patriarchii, 1992.
 Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia. 5 ed. Stuttgart, Germany: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997.
 La Sainte Bible. Paris: Alliance Biblique Universelle, 1999.
 "Lord's Prayer." , c. 900.
 Aland, Barbara and Kurt Aland et al. Greek New Testament. 4th ed. Stuttgart, Germany: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1998.
 Allan, Robin, Philip Holmes, and Tom Lundske-Nielsen. Danish: A Comprehensive Grammar. London: Routledge, 1998.
 Arndt, William F. and F. Wilbur Gingrich. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. 2 ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.
 Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1999.
 Cranford, Lorin L. Learning Biblical Koine Greek. 2nd ed. Boiling Springs, NC: C & L Publications, 1999.
 ---. Translation of the Lord's Prayer. , 1999.
 Dubois, Marguerite-Marie et al. LaRousse's French-English English-French Dictionary. New York: Washington Square Press, 1954.
 Fischer, B et al, ed. Biblia Sacre Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem. Stuttgart, Germany: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.
 Forshall, J and F. Madden. The Holy Bible Made by John Wycliffe. Vol. 4: Oxford University Press, 1850.
 Jerome, St. "Editio Vulgata." In <http://ukanaix.cc.ukans.edu/carrie/texts/vulgate/48math.html>.
 Kelly, Page H. "Biblical Hebrew: An Introductory Grammar." . Grand Rapids, MI: Wm B. Eerdmans, 1992.
 Kirchenbuch. "Lord's Prayer in German." In Biblical Scriptures and Prayers in German and English: <http://german.about.com/homework/german/library/blbibel.htm>, 1908.
 Kostomarov, V, ed. Russian For Everybody. Moscow: Russky Yazik, 1992.
 Louw, Johannes P, Eugene A. Nida, ed. Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains. Vol. 1. New York: United Bible Societies, 1989.
 Lust, J, E. Eynikel, and K. Hauspie. A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint. Vol. 1. 2 vols. Stuttgart, Germany: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1992.
 Mitchell, Bruce and Fred C. Robinson. A Guide to Old English. 4th Revised ed. New York: Basil Blackwell, 1988.
 Moeller, Jack et al. Deutsche Heute: Grundstufe. 6th ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1996.
 Newmark, Leonard. Standard Albanian: A Reference Grammar for Students. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1982.
 ---, ed. Albanian-English Dictionary. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
 Paves, A. C. Fourteenth Century English Biblical Versions. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1904.
 Poldauf, Ivan et al. English-Czech Czech-English Dictionary. 10 ed.: WD Publications, 1998.
 Rahlfs, Alfred, ed. Setuaginta. Stuttgart. Germany: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979.
 Sasse, H. -C, J. Horne, and Charlotte Dixon. Cassell's German English Dictionary. New York: Macmillan, 1966.
 Short, David. Czech: A Complete Course for Beginners. Chicago: NTC/Contemporary Publications, 1994.
 Stacy, R. Wayne. "Translation of the Lord's Prayer." , 1999.

- Sweet, Henry. *A Student's Dictionary of Anglo-Saxon*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963.
- Thompson, Della, ed. *The Concise Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- Ullman, B. L. and Norman E. Henry. *Second Latin Book*. Revised ed. New York: Macmillan, 1929.
- . *New Elementary Latin*. Revised ed. New York: MacMillan, 1936.
- Weigle, Luther A., ed. *New Testament Octupla: Eight English Versions in the Tyndale-King James Tradition*. New York: T. Nelson, 1962.
- Wheeler, Marcus. *Oxford Russian-English Dictionary*. 2 ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Secondary Sources**
- Baugh, Albert C. and Thomas Cable. *A History of the English Language*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1978.
- Bickerton, Derek. *Language and Species*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.
- . *Language and Human Behavior*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1995.
- Cavalli-Sforza, Luigi Luca and Francesco Cavalli-Sforza. *The Great Human Diasporas: The History of Diversity and Evolution*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1995.
- Coote, Stephen. *English Literature of the Middle Ages*. London: Penguin, 1988.
- Darwin, Charles. *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Survival*. New York: Mentor, 1958.
- Dawkins, Richard. *The Extended Phenotype: The Long Reach of the Gene*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- . *The Selfish Gene*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- . *The Blind Watchmaker: Why the Evidence for Evolution Reveals a Universe Without Design*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co, 1996.
- . *Climbing Mount Improbable*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co, 1996.
- . *Chimpanzee Politics: Power and Sex Among Apes*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982.
- . *Peacemaking Among Primates*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989.
- de Waal, Frans and Frans Lanting. *Bonobo: The Forgotten Ape*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.
- Deacon, Terrence W. *The Symbolic Species: the Co-evolution of Language and the Brain*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1997.
- Dennett, Daniel C. *Darwin's Dangerous Idea: Evolution and the Meaning of life*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1995.
- Donald, Merlin. *Origin of the Modern Mind: Three Stages in the Evolution of Culture and Cognition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991.
- Dunbar, Robin. *Grooming, Gossip, and the Evolution of Language*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998.
- Green, John Richard. *A Short History of the English People*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1891.
- Hollister, C. Warren. *The Impact of the Norman Conquest*. New York: Wiley, 1969.
- . *The Making of England: 55 B.C. to 1399*. 7th ed. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath and Co., 1996.
- Leiberman, Philip. *Eve Spoke: Human Language and Human Evolution*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co, 1998.
- McGrew, William C, Linda F. Marchant, and Toshisada Nishida, ed. *Great Ape Societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Millward, C. M. *Biography of the English Language*. 2nd ed. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace, 1996.
- Mithen, Steven. *The Prehistory of the Mind: The Cognitive Origins of Art, Religion, and Science*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1996.
- Noble, William and Iain Davidson. *Human Evolution Language and Mind: A Psychological and Archeological Inquiry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Orwell, George. 1984. London: Saunders, 1949.

Pinker, Steven. *Learnability and Cognition: The Acquisition of Argument Structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1989.

---. *The Language Instinct: How the Mind Creates Language*. New York: Harperperennial, 1994.

---. *How the Mind Works*. New York: HarperPerennial, 1997.

---. *Words and Rules: The Ingredients of Language*. New York: Basic Books, 1999.

Ruhlen, Merritt. *The Origin of Language: Tracing the Evolution of the Mother Tongue*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1994.

Wrangham, Richard, W. C. McGrew, Frans B. M. de Waal, and Paul G. Heltne, ed. *Chimpanzee Cultures*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994.

Wrangham, Richard and Dale Peterson. *Demonic Males: Apes and the Origins of Human Violence*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co, 1996.

Wright, Robert. *The Moral Animal: Evolutionary Psychology and Everyday Life*. New York: Vintage Books, 1994.

1 Note: The Masculine singular nominative form is used here for simplicity.

2 Note: Approximately the equivalent of nominative case form in more highly inflected languages.

3 Note: Approximately the equivalent of accusative case form in more highly inflected languages.

4 Note: this concept shall be explained fully at a later point.

5 Note: In the Greek, the *ou* is actually the masculine singular genitive ending in the Greek.

TORTUOUS ACTS IN THE HOME: IT'S A WAR ZONE BEHIND CLOSED DOORS

KATHERINE BURCH

Author's Note:

I have heard it said by many individuals both men and women that something is wrong with women that stay in abusive relationships. They blame the woman for staying. The fact that she is beaten and lives in fear does not enter their mind. They don't understand that most women in this situation love this person for who they are when they don't act like this. Furthermore, most of these women have children with the person, and are financially dependent on that person. It's even harder to find protection against this person. Domestic violence is more complicated than just leaving.

Rape is the same it is more or less seen as the victim's fault no matter the country or culture. Everyone thinks it's something she wore. It's not about sex, like domestic violence, it is about control: complete and total. It's not masochistic it's sick. I heard one police officer say that he had only seen one real sexual assault. It's alarming when someone who is supposed to be there to protect doesn't believe the person he protects.

Introduction to Violence Against Women

A fist slams into your face as your body falls hard to floor. You are picked up and slammed against the wall. It sounds like something from a violent movie, but in actuality this episode happens in homes all around the world. Or picture a man forcing a woman to have sexual intercourse with him. Tears stream down her face and she whimpers.

Both domestic violence and sexual assault is a human rights violation that takes place every day and there is little governmental action to stop it. Violence against women is compounded by discrimination on grounds of race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, social status, class and age.¹ Poor and socially marginalized women are particularly liable to torture and ill treatment, said Broken Bodies and Shattered Minds.² There are no

international or national legal codes to protect these women from being physically or sexually assaulted.

Domestic violence causes women to fear for their lives and with good reason. It is estimated that “one in three women will be raped and one in six is in an abusive relationship”.³ The UN Preliminary Report on Violence Against Women rightly points out that the nature of violence against women has inhibited women as a group from enjoying the full benefits of human rights.⁴ The report notes that “women have been vulnerable to acts of violence in the family, in the community and by States. The recorded incidents of such violence have reached such unprecedented proportions that they have shocked the conscience of the world.

Women also endure another fear which men almost never confront the fear of rape.⁵ Fear of rape is a battleground in the lives of women from which they can never escape. Torture of women is rooted in a global culture which denies women equal rights with men and which legitimizes the violent appropriation of women’s bodies for individual gratification or political ends.⁶ (Battered Women, Shattered Minds, 3).

Women’s lives are dangerous, and it is the acquisitive and potentially violent nature of male sexuality that is the cause of the danger.⁷ Much of the violence faced by women in everyday life is at the hands of the people with whom they share their lives, whether as members of their family, of their community or as their employers.⁸ So maybe you should think again before concluding it could not happen to you, your friends or your female family members, because it is likely that more than a few have been or are currently involved in a violent domestic relationship.

It happens in Africa, America, the Philippines, India, and the Middle East. Violence occurs equally in every group. It’s a phenomenon that strikes in every racial and socioeconomic category. Violence is done for political and cultural reasons, not racial. Kathleen Kreneck of the Wisconsin Coalition against Domestic Violence remarked, “Men batter to control. Sexism is very political. The use of violence is an extension of this. Historically, it has been accepted. For decades we believed that men owned women and children. This is why we have worked so hard to keep it in the home.”⁹ (Downs,

Furthermore, domestic violence and rape occur in every country around the world. Being hit by your husband or being raped knows no national boundaries. Most nations do have some legal code or have signed an international treaty to make such abuse illegal, but the actual enforcement of the codes is quite similar in most of the nations. The legal codes are written to the advantage of men. This is because of the culture and the time when national laws were written.

It's a man's world

Theorists like Locke, Hegel, Rousseau, whose intellectual writing so profoundly influenced the founders of modern Western democracy easily dismissed women; those writings on democratic theory today who leave out women are simply following a well-established pattern.¹⁰ Women are not acknowledged in most national or international laws. It could be argued that even in democratic nations women have to struggle to get seemingly equal rights with men. Additionally, women in other political systems care much less about women's rights. In a political or social environment such as these, beating or raping a woman is not seen as that much of an illegal action much less as a tortuous act. Why is torture, when state sponsored, a violation of democratic principles, while domestic abuse has been, and still is to some extent, condoned in Western democracies?

In most countries, wife beating is an acceptable form of control whether legal or illegal.¹¹ Violence against women is the belief fostered in all cultures, that men are superior. Women live their lives as possessions and are treated as such by men. Charlesworth writes that the male centered view of equality is tacitly reinforced by the United Nations convention's focus on public life, the economy, the law, and education.¹² The author adds that its very limited recognition that oppression within the private sphere, that of the domestic and family worlds, contributes to women's inequality.¹³ This continually buttresses inequality and violence against women. If there is political and social equality, women must try to reconstruct themselves into being similar to men. The international or national prohibition on sex discrimination promises equality to women who attempt to conform to a male mode and offers little to those who do not.¹⁴

Charlesworth said in her research that the larger problem is that women are in an inferior position because they have no real power in either the public or private worlds and international human rights law, like most economic, social, cultural and legal constructs, which reinforces this powerlessness.¹⁵ Whether a country is a "western" or "third world" nation, the actions against women are typically the same: there is little if any legal action against men who beat and rape women. According to World Bank figures, at least twenty percent of women around the world have been physically abused or sexually assaulted.¹⁶

This inaction against domestic violence and sexual assault causes numerous women to end up in hospitals with severe injuries or facing death. A woman cannot live in a state of continuous terror, and what a battered woman learns in an abusive relationship is how to define her in such a way that she can on occasion suppress the fear.¹⁷ An abused woman learns to compensate for the beatings or the raping by cutting off her emotions, similar to a person in a war zone. In almost every case the only way to end this culture of male abuse and female accommodation is to change society,

cultural, and religious attitudes. In every nation these attitudes cause the lack of action. It is of course integral to a woman's human rights and her dignity to live in safe circumstances in the privacy of her home.

Domestic abuse and rape should be recognized as an international human rights abuse because it violates women being equal and integral parts of society. Even more so, Part III Article 6 of the United Nations International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights confirms this assertion by saying, "every human being has the inherent right" to live not die.¹⁸ Law shall protect these rights. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of life.¹⁹ Wives, mothers, girlfriends, female strangers, female friends, and daughters deserve this inherent right not to be physically or sexually violated. Their sex should have little to do with living safely in their homes.

These abuses constitute discrimination against women as a group in that their purpose is to maintain both the individual woman and women as a group in an inferior, subordinated position.²⁰ Furthermore, the beatings, rape, and ill treatment against women by men cause more than discrimination; they cause heart-wrenching pain. The pain women feel may be unique, but women and men are alike in that they hate pain and resist pain.²¹ Even more, most people don't like to watch others suffer. This is the problem with the pain most women feel: it's seen as private and untouchable. Most of this pain suffered goes unheard because it goes on in the privacy of homes.

Campbell writes in *Unequal Democracies: The Gender Yardstick* that marriage is what all private and public laws are based on in relation to women and men.²² The only legitimate means of dismissing women, then, becomes dividing the world into a public sphere, where an individual's relationship with the government is central to liberal democratic thought.²³ The second sphere deals with the right to privacy in which individual relationships-even if encouraged, sanctified, and recognized by the state-become a private issue not worthy of philosophic political inquiry.²⁴ Therefore most of the problems women face, which are in the privacy of homes, is ignored.

On the surface, family privacy seems like a particularly incoherent foundation for defending state passivity toward domestic violence. The policy of non-intervention has the effect of purchasing the freedom of one person (the state will not interfere with the abuser's violence) by sacrificing the freedom of the other person (the state will not interfere with the abuser's violence).²⁵

International human rights declarations give individuals and groups, otherwise without access to the international legal system, the possibility of making international legal claims. Thus this opportunity expands the otherwise state-centered discourse of international law.²⁶ This law can serve as the language of victims and the dispossessed.²⁷10 Women around the world are a part of this dispossessed and unrecognized group.

The international code of human rights is divided into three categories:

civil and political rights; economic, social and cultural rights; and group rights. Rights of women are placed into the third category, which is seen to be the least valued in the international legal codes.²⁸ Most of the international treaties use some sort of elaboration, which stipulates only that women should be treated equally with men.²⁹ Therefore, women are placed under the physical and sexual mercy of men in private, legal, political and cultural mercy of the world. Men made the laws and women had to work to get equality within them.

Apart from this limited promise of help from the international treaties, most of the treaties "tended to ignore the application of human rights norms to women."³⁰ Like torture, domestic violence against women is both physical and verbal.³¹ The UN Torture Convention defines torture as including mental as well as physical suffering and softens the distinction between torture and ill treatment.³² The UN chooses to ignore domestic violence as torture for various reasons.

The UN Convention is more specific about state responsibility.³³ Compromising between those who wanted to include privately inflicted torture and those who felt that domestic law enforcement should take care of those cases, the drafters of the Convention included private acts of torture or ill treatment when carried out with the "consent or acquiescence of a public official."³⁴ With this statement the UN can ignore the depth of the domestic violence problem.

The fact that women's human rights are not protected, and that violence against women is rising, seems incongruous given what the United Nations Charter states and what nations say they will do about protecting human rights. The United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights states:

"The peoples of the United Nations have in their Charter reaffirmed their faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person and in the equal rights of men and women and have determined to promote social progress and better standards of living."³⁵

The Charter goes even further by stating in Article 3 that "everyone has the rights to life, liberty, and the security of person".³⁶ Article 4 states that no one "shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman, and degrading treatment or punishment."³⁷ Women face torture at home every single day. They are beaten and have cigarettes burnt out on their skin. It seems odd that many western nations and third world nations have signed international treaties to end torture as well as to protect women's rights, yet for all those signatures millions of women are subjected to abuse every day.

At base level, Article 1 provides for humans to be provided with human rights and fundamental freedoms without discrimination against these fundamental rights. In the 1945 United Nations Charter the goal was articulated, "To achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental

freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion."³⁸

Designations of race, religion, and nationality are listed throughout the charter. Yet, sex is not listed in all instances as being protected. It could also be argued that women are not protected in this charter because at the time it was written international laws were completely almost a male field. This led to predominantly male-oriented and devised legal codes. This lack of protection of women from the UN leads to a lack of protection of women in national governments.

Another faulty point in the charter is in Article 2, which stipulates non-intervention in domestic issues. For women, this undermines the whole intent of rights and legal protection because this is where most of the harm against females occurs. Article 2 states that "nothing contained in the present Chapter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state..."³⁹

Women being beaten in their homes are considered to be domestic jurisdiction. The United Nations does provide protection against abuse against women during wartime, such as in Serbia during the wars of the 1990s. Yet most local or national police forces provide little protection for women in instances of sexual or physical assault. Women are still raped and beaten and live in complete fear, despite official UN prohibitions against such situations because it is considered within the private sphere.

Finally, Article 2 weakens the UN protection of human rights because it makes it harder for the UN and its agencies to conduct studies on violence against women in the home. Violence in the home is a staggering problem worldwide. It is even harder for strides to be made in domestic violence and sexual assault against women when these forms of abuse go unrecognized by the dominant organization in international law. Rhonda Copelon, a law professor at the City University of New York and the codirector of its International Women's Human Rights clinic, feels strongly about crimes against women. She stated in MacKinnon's study on rape as a method of war, "To protect women globally we must insist that rape is an atrocity in all its contexts, in war as well as in the everyday,"⁴⁰

Despite the rights abuses women face today and have always faced, the UN stills claims that it upholds rights for all. In Article 55, it states it will promote "universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion."⁴¹ But the UN has not done so.

Charlesworth's research documents that international laws dealing with women have weaker implementation obligations and procedures than those that deal with racial or religious obligations; the institutions designed to draft and monitor them are under-resourced and their roles often circumscribed compared to other human rights bodies.⁴² Furthermore, the widespread practice of states in making reservations to fundamental provisions in the instruments is apparently tolerated; as is the failure of states generally to

fulfill their obligations under the instruments.⁴³ The nonintervention of the UN in human rights abuses has mainly to do with currently accepted notions state sovereignty.

Because human rights principally regulate the ways states treat their own citizens within their own territory, international human rights policies would seem to involve unjustifiable intervention in the sovereignty of nations.⁴⁴ Another problem in relation to international law and state legal code is the state becoming involved in the private activities of individuals in their homes. This in most nations is off limits to government regulation unless something illegal is ongoing. The UN Convention is more specific about state responsibility.⁴⁵ The word public has everything to do with why this human rights abuse is not recognized as such. It is seen as a private problem.

Charlesworth argues the larger problem is that women are in an inferior position because they have no real power in either the public or private worlds, and international human rights law, like most economic, social, cultural and legal constructs, reinforces this powerlessness.⁴⁶ The author goes on to state that the male-centered view of equality is tacitly reinforced by the UN Convention's focus on public life, the economy, the law, education, and its very limited recognition that oppression within the private sphere, that of the domestic and family worlds, contributes to women's inequality.⁴⁷

The home in the eighteenth, nineteenth and twentieth centuries was handled in much the same manner that politics was handled. The international society of states in these centuries gave respect to the sovereign prerogative of each state to treat its own citizens as it saw fit.⁴⁸ These prerogatives were then handed down over the generations and affected the pillars of society: economic policy, government policy and cultural norms. Among the reasons why women are enslaved in these situations include economic dependency; patriarchal, social and religious practices; and the failure of the medical and criminal justice systems to adequately address the question of women's vulnerability to abuse.⁴⁹

Many of the writers who assert that a sexist society is a fertile soil that allows for female abuse also contend that traditional theologies have contributed to the victimization of wives by supplying biblical evidence that God ordains patriarchy.⁵⁰ Clarke (1986), in her book *Pastoral Care of Battered Women*, states:

Theological beliefs become an integral part of one's being and these beliefs are very powerful for a religious woman in a battering relationship. If a battered women's religious convictions lead her to believe that a wife is subordinate to the husband, that marriage is an unalterable life-time commitment, or that suffering is the lot of the faithful, then those convictions have the sanction of God.⁵¹

The researchers concluded that "the dynamics of domestic violence in general, and the abuse of female spouses in particular, are so complex and

intertwined with historical, traditional, psychological, political and social forces that it may be unreasonable to expect any short-term action by the criminal justice system to have a significant deterrent effect."⁵² Overall, effective reform will be a slow process, rather than a radical shift, aimed at changing cultural norms on domestic violence and rape.

Are domestic violence and rape forms of torture?

Part of the international treaties is an inadequately crafted law that protects individuals from needless bodily pain or harm from torture. To constitute torture, pain must be intentionally inflicted against the will of the victim.⁵³ Torture, however, is only considered to occur in the public sphere; it is not considered that people are tortured in their homes.

Torture's special recognition illustrates the UN's commitment to fight violence, which takes exceptional, and heinous forms.⁵⁴ However, domestic violence is not considered to be as exceptional and heinous as state inflicted torture under international and national law. Torture, unlike domestic violence or rape, is defined as a fixed set of characteristics, unaffected by differences in context that may be political, social, economic, and cultural as well as gender-related.⁵⁵

Torture is seen as occurring primarily during wartime or periods of political, cultural or religious tensions but is not considered to take place outside of this context. Where torture is defined in the binding instruments of constitutions and international laws, it generally involves four critical elements: severe physical and/or mental pain and suffering, intentionally inflicted, for specific purposes and with some form of official involvement.⁵⁶ However, domestic violence and rape in many countries are barely acknowledged in national law, much less international laws

Domestic violence and rape entail the same four critical elements as torture. The breaking of the will and the spread of terror, whether on an individual or group basis, is as much a part of rape and domestic violence as it is of torture. Indeed, domestic violence against women is systemic and structural, a mechanism of patriarchal control of women that is built on male superiority and female inferiority.⁵⁷ Other tortuous elements of domestic violence are sex-stereotyped roles and expectations, and the economic, social and political predominance of man and dependency of women.⁵⁸

Physical and psychological violence comprises the mechanisms of control or will breaking. Both domestic violence and torture involve some form of usually escalating, physical brutality.⁵⁹ Fear, both emotional and physical, is a significant feature in battering families.⁶⁰ Its functions include control and entrapment.⁶¹ Physical torture in private or in public does not necessitate any special equipment.⁶² It includes beating, kicking, and the infliction of pain with objects such as canes, knives, and cigarettes.⁶³ The methods of intimate violence resemble the common methods of torture, and

include beating with hands or objects, biting, spitting, punching, kicking, slashing, stabbing, strangling, scalding, burning, and attempted drowning.⁶⁴

Sexual abuse, rape, and the forcing of instruments or animals into the vagina are common, as well as among the most devastating, form of torture for women.⁶⁵ Sexual violence in the form of forced undressing, pawing, threats of rape, or being forced to perform sexual acts are also common ways of breaking the will of women.⁶⁶ The consequences include physical and mental pain and suffering, disfigurement, temporary and permanent disabilities, miscarriage, maiming and death.⁶⁷ All of these physical and sexual abuses are recognized as torture outside of the home but once the door to a private residence is closed, law enforcement does little to regulate this private torture.

The other part of the torture and domestic violence is the mind games that go on between the victim and the perpetrator. The perpetrator tries to be both enemy and "friend" to the victim. The enemy causes the pain and the friend "helps" end the pain when the perpetrator receives what he wants from the victim. The psychological component of torture consists of the anguish, humiliation, debilitation and fear caused by physical brutality, rape and sexual abuse.⁶⁸ Other methods designed to break the will of the tortured are threats of further pain and methods of sensory deprivation, stress and manipulation.⁶⁹

Torturers use subtle methods to break the prisoner's will: isolation, arbitrary and unpredictable punishments, and intermittent rewards. They also use the alternation of active and passive brutality with kindness in order to undermine the prisoner's morale-sustaining hatred of the torturers and convert the torturer into a savior.⁷⁰ All these methods, designed to exhaust endurance and manipulate dependency, underscore the significance of the psychological in torture-that torture is a complex and process of domination and not just a set of brutal physical acts.⁷¹

Officially recognized torture and domestic violence entails the same kinds of anguish, humiliation, physical and sexual abuses, threats of more brutality and the fear of death. Others, such as fellow prisoners, women or children, are abused and threatened to more effectively break the will of the victim. The anguish and disintegration of the self can be accomplished through methods that passively as well as actively attacks the body.⁷²

Just as the process of manipulation is the same in domestic violence and torture, so is the process of survival. Battered women exhibit hostage-like behaviors such as praising their abuser, denying the battering, and blaming themselves.⁷³ These behaviors may in actuality represent a struggle for survival.⁷⁴ This survival mechanism can produce extreme states of dependency, debility and dread as well as the same intense symptoms that comprise the post-traumatic stress disorders (PTSD) experienced by victims of official violence.⁷⁵

To survive these attacks in a battering relationship, one must adapt and

develop survival behaviors and, in fact, that is what battered women do similar to prisoners of war.⁷⁶ Some people think that leaving is easy and those abused women must like to be hit or they would not stay.⁷⁷ This assumption could not be farther from the truth.

But in reality, battered women are "imprisoned" in their relationships by some of the same psychological bonds, which entrap hostages or prisoners of war. Romero (1985) theorized that the strategies of control and coercion used on prisoners of war were comparable to those used on battered women: psychological abuse occurring in the context of violence, the employment of emotional dependency created through intermittent reinforcement and isolation from the victim's support system.⁷⁸

A common aftermath of both torture and domestic violence and rape is the posttraumatic stress syndrome (PTSD). PTSD is an anxiety disorder produced by an uncommon, extremely stressful event (e.g. assault, rape, military combat, death camp) and characterized by re-experiencing the trauma in painful recollections or recurrent dreams.⁷⁹ Other elements involved are diminished responsiveness (numbing), with lack of interest in significant activities and with feelings of detachment and estrangement from others; and such symptoms as exaggerated startle response, disturbed sleep.⁸⁰ Finally victims suffering from PTSD have difficulty in concentrating or remembering, guilt about surviving when others did not, and avoidance of activities that call the traumatic event to mind.⁸¹

Torture, domestic violence and sexual assault all cause the body and mind to concentrate on surviving the abuse, and as part of this survival instinct, the body goes into what is called the disaster syndrome. It encompasses three psychological stages: (a) shock, disorientation and bewilderment; (b) passivity and lack of capacity to initiate tasks, accompanied by the inability to follow orders; and (c) anxiety and concentration difficulties.⁸² Much the same as prisoners-of-war, battered women whether subjected to physical or psychological abuse, often experience anxiety, depression, and sleeplessness.⁸³ A battered woman may develop a "continuum of tolerance" in which she puts up with what other women would never think of enduring.⁸⁴ The "social judgment theory" of Sherif and Hovland is suggestive along these lines.⁸⁵ They posit a "latitude of acceptance," within which people exposed to significant ongoing hardship come to accept what most people would never tolerate.

Women often react to being raped in ways that nonvictimized people will not understand, such as delaying reporting of the crime or downplaying the anguish at first.⁸⁶ PTSD has emerged as the umbrella concept that connects Rape Trauma Syndrome, Battered War Syndrome, and war trauma.⁸⁷ Psychiatrist Judith Herman, a leader in the field of victimization syndrome, states,

"Only after 1980, when the efforts of combat veterans had legitimated the concept of post-traumatic stress disorder, did it become clear that the psychological syndrome seen in survivors of

war is the same as that seen in victims of domestic abuse.”⁸⁸

A World of Problems

Worldwide, societies have sanctioned victimization of women through such practices as genital mutilation, foot binding, dowry death, selective malnourishment, female infanticide, forced prostitution and violent pornography.⁸⁹ In most countries, wife beating is a socially acceptable form of control whether formally legal or illegal.⁹⁰ Women, unlike men, live in a world with two sovereigns—the state and men—and this is true not just some of the time but all of the time.⁹¹ As Hirshel, Hutchison, Dean and Mills (1992, pg. 27) have asserted, “Spouse abuse is probably the only area of criminal behavior in which it has been considered necessary to justify the arrest of offenders on the grounds that such arrests will serve as a deterrent.”⁹² In the end analysis, it is perhaps best to conclude that violence against women is a function of the belief, fostered in all cultures, that men are inherently the dominant sex.⁹³ The women they live with are their possessions. Copelon goes further by saying that men “seek and confirm the devaluation and dehumanization of women through violence”.⁹⁴

The reasons for domestic violence, torture or rape are essentially identified: they revolve around control, power, inferiority, superiority, and making the victim do the bidding of the abuser. The UN Draft Violence Declaration emphasizes violence as “the essential and ultimate social mechanism by which women are forced into a subordinate position as compared to men.”⁹⁵ The difference, however, between torture and violence against women is their treatment in society and in the law.

All three happen every hour of every day in every country in the world. The only cross-national difference is the extent of protection, or more likely lack of protection. Torture is treated with much more legal respect, with prosecutions at higher rates than those are for rape and domestic violence. The main reason for this is the sex of the victims and the fact that domestic violence happens in the home while torture officially does not. However, those who argue that all three do not occur in the home are blind-sided by sexism.

Nations vary in the amount of protection offered to women in their society. Some nations provide as much legal protection as to men, but make a distinction between men and women in recognition that women have distinct legal problems and needs. Other nations provide the exact same protections for women and men, seeing no need to distinguish between the two sexes. Still other countries do not stipulate any rights for women whatsoever. The women within these cultures are completely and utterly subservient to their husbands and male relatives. The failure of a state to ensure that women have equal opportunities for education, shelter, food and employment and access to formal state power is another facet of the state's

responsibility for abuses of women.⁹⁶ Continued discrimination against women contributes to their inadequate participation in decision-making.⁹⁷

Four of the common cross-national components of domestic violence are the public versus private dichotomy; religious views; cultural views; and the lack of action against the abuser. A United States study on gender bias in the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts explains a prime reason for the problem of domestic violence. "As in the case of abusers, ignorance about the psychology of female victims of domestic violence interferes with the ability of the legal system to respond in an effective way."⁹⁸

The US supposedly has the best reputation for women's rights. By contrast, India has one of the world's worst reputations for women's rights. The culture and the religions militate against women enjoying substantial rights. Women are beneath men. The Middle East is also well known for its lack of respect for women and their rights. The prevalent reasoning behind their culture, which emphasizes that women are subordinate to men, is the Islamic faith. Finally Finland and the Netherlands are some of the few nations that more completely uphold women's rights.

Case Study: United States

The United States is known as the home of the free. In this country, women's causes have advanced but in the realm of domestic violence and sexual assault the nation still has a long way to go. In the United States, despite the countless abuse prevention groups and the fight for understanding in the area of domestic violence, it seems there has been little progress. In fact, battering alone is now the leading cause of injury to women in the United States.⁹⁹ Family violence statistics states the FBI, "may be seriously underreported."¹⁰⁰ Total reported violent incidents average 450,000 annually, with more than half committed by spouses or ex-spouses.¹⁰¹ Official reports in the USA say that a woman is battered every 15 seconds while 700,000 women are raped a year.¹⁰² Only a few years ago the Federal Bureau of Investigation reported that in the U.S. a man beat a woman every eighteen seconds; now it is twelve seconds.¹⁰³ In most nations today, domestic violence has much the same rate of occurrence. It is simply hidden well in the United States; and yet this type of abuse is deeply embedded in American culture and other cultures.

Great deals of the studies on violence against women are done in the western nations, particularly the United States. The issue in the U.S. has a great deal to do with society, religion and the private versus public dichotomy. American feminists would argue that the state is instrumental in the maintenance of two systems of inequality, which are class and gender.¹⁰⁴ Feminists go further by arguing that the victim of the violence is placed in the position of enforcer and must initiate action against her perpetrator at each step.¹⁰⁵ The problem in the U.S. is more to do with cultural attitudes rather than the legal system. As in the case of abusers, ignorance about the

psychology of female victims of domestic violence interferes with the ability of the legal system to respond in an effective way.¹⁰⁶ Victims of domestic abuse are frequently criticized for remaining in the abusive relationships. This societal blame in the U.S. may compromise a victim's willingness to seek and the ability to receive relief.¹⁰⁷

Why women stay is simple to understand. These women suffer from low self-esteem, helplessness, and economic and emotional dependence on the relationship with the abuser, isolation and a lack of social support.¹⁰⁸ Finally despite the belief that this problem individually or in a group setting is exaggerated is not so. Battered women tend not to exaggerate the violence or abuse, but instead tend to minimize the severity and extent of the abuse.¹⁰⁹

These American state laws represent the erosion of the public/private distinction as a barrier to regulating the "private" sphere of family life, where, so the argument has gone individuals should be free to act without "public" intervention. To what extent have these statutes actually overcome the influence of the public/private distinction in the attitudes of those who enforce the acts?¹¹⁰

The US does have strict policies and laws to help protect women against domestic violence. The problem lies when law enforcement and courts execute these laws and policies. Mandatory arrest for domestic violence is a prevalent theme within state and local laws. These laws were put in place only after women's groups successfully sued police departments over their failure to arrest, charging denial of equal protection of the law.¹¹¹ The Minneapolis Domestic Violence Experiment concluded that these laws did deter violence but studies on the same laws in other areas did not find decrease but higher levels of offense.¹¹² It could be concluded that even after laws are put into place, the problem of violence against women does not go away.

Another problem is not allowing the victim to be the victim. Whether in the U.S. or in another nation, they are put on trial. One of these territories was rape. It could include questions about a rape victim's background and character, allowing the defense to raise doubts about the victim's innocence.¹¹³ One defense attorney did get acquittal by mentioning the rape victim's colorful lifestyle.¹¹⁴ The result of this law was to undermine years of progress toward elimination of questioning about the sexual conduct of rape victims.¹¹⁵ So it seems the welfare of women is pushed aside by a great many male-friendly legal codes whether in a western or third world nation.

Finland: A near perfect world?

Finnish women have never really had a radical feminist grassroots organization to ensure women's rights. Maybe that is why there is just beginning to be a push for legal venues to protect women. Sulkunen argues that with the notable exception of the upper social classes, women did not really perceive their social and political rights to be at odds with the rights of men in their own class.¹¹⁶ The author goes on to argue that women saw themselves to be largely on an equal footing, seeing men as comrades and allies in the struggle to win a better life for every Finnish citizen.¹¹⁷ Maybe the Finnish women should have looked at themselves as equal to almost everyone female in the world: capable of being beaten or raped.

Family violence occurs in all social categories, which makes it essentially an issue centered on the relationship between the sexes.¹¹⁸ Finland is more conservative than the other Nordic countries in this issue area.¹¹⁹ For example, rape occurring in marriage was only criminalized in 1994, and family violence was only made a matter for the public prosecutor in 1995.¹²⁰

It was written in *La Lettre*, 15, April 29 that domestic violence is so common in Finland that the average person should be more afraid of his home than of the streets. According to studies, domestic violence occurs in 12% of Finnish families; victims are mostly women but also children, men and pensioners.¹²¹ There is no evidence to suggest that it has become more common in the past few years, but it has become a visible social problem.¹²² The problem in Finland is more cultural and legal. The semi-serious Finnish proverb says that the ideal man of a Finnish woman is one who hits only when he is drunk.¹²³ Traditionally the police, social services, intoxicant treatment centers and health care services have provided help in situations of domestic violence.¹²⁴ Domestic violence is both a private and a public problem. According to a Gallup-poll, more than a third of Finns do not want to "interfere with things that do not concern them" if their neighbors are having an incident of domestic violence.¹²⁵ The problem lies with underreporting not the police action.

On this subject, it is interesting to note also that the Ministry of Social Affairs and Health in Finland has remarked [1] that treatment programs for violent men cost much less than the consequences of violence.¹²⁶ In fact, it has been established that one act of violence in a family may easily cost society 185,000 Finnish marks (more than £20,000) [2]. In comparison, treatment of a violent man costs less than £700 (corresponding to individual evaluation sessions for three months and 15 group therapy sessions).¹²⁷ Even for government action it must be proven that domestic violence is costly to the pocket not to the human life.

India: Case Study

Women in India face the same problems as American and Finnish women. Their situation is worsened by the fact that they have few political or social rights in their country. Although no one knows the number of Indian women beaten, burned or otherwise physically abused in connection with dowry demands, some idea of the scale is indicated by the Indian government's statement that 6929 dowry deaths were reported in 1998.¹²⁸ Women are killed for the type of dowry they do not bring to the husband's family and sometimes are killed after the family receives the dowry.

The Indian Constitution guarantees in Article 14 that "the state shall not deny to any person equality before the law or the equal protection of the laws within the territory of India."¹²⁹ While Article 15 "prohibits discrimination against any citizen by the state on the grounds only of religion, race, caste, sex, place of birth or any of them; nothing in this article shall prevent the state from making special provision for women."¹³⁰

Despite the claims within the Indian constitution, very little is done in practice to safeguard women's rights. In India, studies have found that more than 40 percent of married women reported being kicked, slapped or sexually abused for reasons such as their husbands' dissatisfaction with their cooking or cleaning, jealousy and a variety of other motives.¹³¹ Yet anecdote evidence indicates that violence against women in India has assumed terrifying proportions, both within the family and outside.¹³² In the family the woman is often subjected to all forms of domestic violence, death for her dowry and sometimes rape.¹³³ Outside the family she is subjected to rape, molestation and sexual harassment at work, among other forms of violence.¹³⁴ Further, new forms of violence like female feticide and a regeneration of older forms like sati have taken place.¹³⁵ This worsening increase in crime reflects the worsening status of Indian women, which also shows itself in the falling female birth ratio, rising unemployment and wide-scale discrimination and harassment at work.¹³⁶ Singh proposed the reasoning behind this is the attitude and behavior of those who enforce criminal law.¹³⁷ Rape is a crime that is not severely punished in India. Rape is seen as a degrading crime, as is domestic violence, causing a great deal of emotional and physical pain for the victim. The problem, however, is how the victim of rape is perceived. Singh noted in her research that in Indian culture, rape victims are viewed with doubt and suspicion, and are assumed to have incited the attack upon them.

Another problem in India lies within the national judicial system, which is dominated by male jurists and hands down judgments that make it impossible for rape to be seen as a crime much less as torture. India has a problem with providing adequate rape legislation and education on the subject as well. In India, the law with regard to evidence in rape case allows that "when a man is prosecuted for rape or an attempt to ravish, it may be shown that the prosecutrix was of generally immoral character."¹³⁸ Ironically,

the character of the rapist is not even considered in the court hearing, and even more shocking is that police are not required to send rape victims for medical examination.¹³⁹ Such circumstances allow women to be raped and beaten while the legal system turns a blind eye.

Islamic nations: case study

Islamic culture views women in much the same light as does Indian culture, with women in Islamic societies subjected to similar forms of discrimination and subjugation. Just as in most other countries, the problem of violence against women has a great deal to do with embedded cultural and religious values. The Qur'an, the basic Islamic teachings, retains the view; prevalent in antiquity and the east that men are essentially superior to women. This is very clear in this verse from the Qur'an: *The men are overseers over the women by reason of what Allah hath bestowed in bounty upon one more than another, and of the property which they contributed. Upright women are therefore submissive, guarding what is hidden in return for Allah's guarding (them); those on those part ye fear refractoriness, admonish, avoid in bed, and beat if they then obey you, seek no (further) way against them* (4:34-38).¹⁴⁰

Othman argues that the subordination of women is not intrinsic to the Islamic faith but it is when religion is put into practice that this comes about.¹⁴¹ The author goes on to state that the development of the Shari'a and how it was applied in early and classical Islamic civilization has led contemporary fundamentalists to harbor antagonism against women.¹⁴² A culture where degradation against women is allowed openly and publicly have little respect for what happens to women in their homes

Othman contends that it should be possible for women as well as men to be accepted as humans, and goes further by saying this idea is not alien to the Islamic text.¹⁴³ However, the concept of equal humanity for men and women is quite different from when religious leaders and political heads of Islamic nations interpret the Qur'an. One author had this to say about human rights and women's rights:

"With respect to the status of Muslim women: although it is true that they have full legal capacity under Shari'a in relation to civil law and commercial law matters, in the sense that they have the requisite legal personality to hold and dispose of property and otherwise acquire or lose civil liabilities in their independent right, Muslim women do not enjoy human rights on an equal footing with Muslim men under the Shari'a," said Abdullahi A. An-Na'im on Islamic reformation."¹⁴⁴

Indicative also is that most of the Islamic nations have yet to sign any human rights or women's rights international charters. Othman suggests that Islamic nations are not involved with human rights charters that consider the broader rights for women and non-Muslims because they are intentionally

avoiding it or are ignoring the international subject.¹⁴⁵ Othman's arguments are quite ironic considering the staggering number of honor crimes, including torture and killing, which are reported in countries such as Iraq, Jordan and Turkey.¹⁴⁶ These honor crimes give ownership of women to men; therefore, when woman's chastity is questioned so is the honor of the man, and the woman pays the price.¹⁴⁷ This rests on the Muslim traditionalist position on women's rights, which holds that Islam recognizes no notion of gender equality, due to the fact that women created after men and women are there specifically for men's use.¹⁴⁸ These religious and cultural notions do not promote a safe haven for women; rather, they create an environment conducive to high rates of abuse.

Malaysia is one Islamic nation which provides a good example of a place that does not uphold women's rights or human rights, so neither torture or violence against women is seen as a problem. In 1995, a Domestic Violence Act was placed before the Malaysian government. The Islamic Affairs Department argued that the act contradicted the Shari'a and would enable Muslim women to invoke the application of a law other than the Shari'a against their husbands.¹⁴⁹

The reasoning behind this was that the proposed legislation would then compromise the Islamists' contention that the Shari'a should be the only law of Malaysian Muslims.¹⁵⁰ Even further, the Islamic courts placed more emphasis on to persuading both partners to preserve a failing marriage than on with assuring safety and security for the woman within the home.¹⁵¹

The essential argument of the leaders of the Malaysian Muslims was that women had no rights to protection in the domestic realm.¹⁵² In fact, the Shari'a provides no protection for women when they are harmed within the home. Othman goes on to assert that the Malaysian Muslims are prepared to tolerate widespread abuse and violence against women in marriage and the family as the price for maintaining the supremacy of the Shari'a as their bulwark of their own political interests. These fundamentalist Muslims refuse to use the teachings of the Hadith. The Hadith is an important scripture for the Islamic community, because it teaches the oral traditions of the prophet Muhammad. The Hadith teaches that in his chapter on ethics "And they (the women) have rights similar to those (men have) over them in a just manner."

Rape a Weapon of War: Case Study

The state is helping the women of many nations to be tortured every day. In East Timor where sex violence was used as a weapon of war the victims did not receive the sympathy one would suspect. Rather the victims encountered direct hatred for what had happened to them. Seth Mydens wrote that the victims have often become outcasts within East Timor. Mydens goes further by saying that some have been shunned by their husbands and their communities as "dirty" and in some cases family members

have threatened to kill babies born of rapes¹⁵³. With these types of feelings so apparent in East Timor most victims do not report what happened to them. The victims also fear that they will be prosecuted for their "relationships" with militia members.¹⁵⁴

In East Timor women are abused and sexually assaulted to place fear in women to keep them submissive. This same dynamic occurred in the Bosnian, Herzegovina and Croatian conflicts. All of these conflicts occurred during a tumultuous political, religious or social upheaval. Women were used to demonstrate the horrors that would be inflicted upon the enemy if they did not submit. Yet despite all the rapings, beatings, killings and other sexual atrocities, there was little punishment by either the United Nations or the international war crimes tribunal. Seth Mydans reports that in the New York Times that until only recently has rape been recognized as a war crime and as a crime against humanity.¹⁵⁵

Seth Mydans reports in the New York Times that it became clear to investigators that the crimes of the Indonesian military and the local militias it commanded-opponents of independence-included not only massacres, widespread destruction and mass deportations, but also rape and sexual slavery on a wide and possibly systematic scale.¹⁵⁶ Despite 165 reported and documented cases of "gender based violations", there has only been one charge of rape.¹⁵⁷

The same is true in Bosnia and Croatia. Catharine MacKinnon reports the ethnic cleansing in the wars constituted a removal or liquidation of all non-Serbs from the territory that was called Yugoslavia.¹⁵⁸ This campaign of expansion through ethnic extermination included rape, forcible impregnation, torture, and murder of Muslim and Croatian women, "for Serbia."¹⁵⁹ Superiors in the militias handed down orders to commit these crimes to soldiers, and also had the acts of rape and torture taped. The soldiers watched the tapes and partook in these crimes against women.

MacKinnon believes Serbian aggression against non-Serbs is as incontestable as male aggression is against women in everyday life.¹⁶⁰ The author also notes in her study that some feminists fear that justice will be denied to thousands of women victimized in the conflict because international law does not fully recognize gender-specific crimes.¹⁶¹ Moreover, UN secretary-general Boutros Boutros-Ghali's initial proposal for a tribunal failed to outline a clear procedure for prosecuting rapists and their commanders, and contained no provisions for compensation for victims.¹⁶² Additionally, despite rape being banned under the Geneva Conventions, the tortuous crime is not recognized as a "grave breach."¹⁶³ However the UN has initiated rape into its list of war crimes. Overall, violence against women, even when it occurs on a large scale is not recognized as torture and goes on unpunished, just as it goes on unpunished in the everyday life of women.

Where is the Problem Heading Up, Down or Nowhere?

Human Rights Watch noted that around the world, including many democratizing countries, there has been an increase in systematic human rights violations against women.¹⁶⁴ For example, soldiers rape women as a tool of war or political repression in the former Yugoslavia, Peru, Kashmir, Somalia and Haiti; police and border guards force women into prostitution in Burma, Thailand, Nepal, India, Bangladesh and Kenya; guards commit violence against refugee and displaced women in Bangladesh and Kenya; guards rape women in prisons and jails in Pakistan, the United States and Egypt; and police and courts turn a blind eye to violence and discrimination in the work place, at home and in reproductive and sexual policies in Kuwait, Russia, Poland, Brazil, South Africa and Turkey.¹⁶⁵

States have a duty under international law to take positive measures to prohibit and prevent torture and to respond to instances of torture, regardless of where the torture takes place and whether the perpetrator is an agent of the state or a private individual.¹⁶⁶ It is unfortunate that the states do not respect the international law or for that matter their own national laws. The way the states are responsible is through complicity, consent or acquiescence and failure to exercise due diligence and to provide equal protection in preventing and punishing such abuses by private individuals.¹⁶⁷ Due diligence includes taking effective steps to prevent abuses, to investigate them when they occur, to prosecute the alleged perpetrator and bring them to justice in fair proceedings and to ensure adequate reparation, including compensation and redress.

At least in the area of legal initiatives, there are some strides being made to combat violence against women. The UN declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women and the Fourth UN World Conference on Women held in Beijing in 1995 set out steps for governments to take to eliminate violence against women.¹⁶⁸ These included reviewing national legislation to ensure effectiveness in eliminating violence against women and emphasizing the prosecution of offenders, providing women with access to the mechanisms of justice for effective remedies. The UN Conference on Women pushed nations to promote policies to reduce violence against women, particularly those policies in law enforcement, police personnel and judicial, medical and social services.¹⁷⁴ The implementation of such steps is one indicator for measuring a state's willingness and ability to protect women against acts of torture.¹⁶⁹ Yet the UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan acknowledged in June 2000 that since the Fourth World Conference on Women five years earlier, violence against women had been made illegal everywhere but such violence had in fact increased.¹⁷⁰

So what can be done to make women safer and to change governmental behavior? The duty of the state is to make sure that fundamental rights to life and to freedom from torture and ill-treatment are extended to women and, when necessary, to moderate tradition through education and the law.¹⁷¹

Amnesty International mentions in its report *Broken Bodies, Shattered Minds* that many abuses against women are not treated as criminal offenses in national law.¹⁷⁶

Physical assault and sexual abuse of women can be proven as torture. It is proven that domestic violence and sexual assault causes similar effects as someone who has been imprisoned during wartime. The long-term effects of repeated battering in the home are physically and psychologically devastating.¹⁷²

Furthermore, despite the state of denial that some world leaders and world organizations are in: governments are actively involved in the abuse of women worldwide. They are involved in this directly for several reasons. For one thing, governments pass legislation and endorse traditions in their countries to disallow women the proper venues of redress: court, medical attention and police action. In some countries, women cannot go to court in person; for example, in Saudi Arabia male relatives must represent the female.¹⁷³

What Will End the Madness?

So what can be done to stop this worldwide private problem? A change in cultural political mindset first and foremost. That means changing how men look at women and the government views these life and death issues which affect women. It would help first if the United States law enforcement community would be more effective at combating sexual assault and physical assault against women. Being the leading nation in the world, we should be a better example. That means police officers actually putting a man under arrest who has just hurt a woman.

It is hard for America to expect other nations to be respectful of human rights and to press countries to sign these human rights charters, when our nation itself does nothing to end human rights abuses here at home. This same argument holds true for the United Nations. International war crimes tribunals do little to protect women. With mass rape and sexual concentration camps in recent wars-Serbia, Croatia, Chechnya, East Timor-that were well known and well documented, very few men were punished for their crimes. The women, who were the victims, were treated with contempt and viewed as the instigators of the crimes against them.

One way to end these abusive acts is to stop the cultural transmission to younger generations of attitudes that it is okay to hit a woman or to rape her. Colleges and public schools could incorporate into their curriculum, for example, a class that explores and analyzes sexual and physical assault against women. It would help as students got older, to inform them of the legal consequences of abuse, and have speakers from domestic abuse or rape programs or victims themselves talk to the students. This is not making students grow up too quick; this is just showing them the un-candy-coated reality in the world: more than half of all women will face sexual or physical

abuse at some point in their lives.

Effective police action would also help. International standards require that complaints and reports are promptly and effectively investigated. In reality, this is almost non-existent. If police were made to actually view abuse as a crime, and not something to laugh about at the station, then possibly women might not have to hide and live in fear the rest of their lives. Governments need to act on this problem.

The United Nations in turn needs to be more aggressive in pushing governments to act on this. Otherwise the problem of violence against women just gets worse. The UN is the only international body that has enough clout to push this subject. If, first, the UN would categorize domestic violence and sexual assault as forms of torture within its treaties then this would show national governments that the abuse of women is important. Furthermore, the UN must be chastised for its ineffective handling of the wars that involved mass rapings and physical assault of women. By turning a blind eye to these acts, the UN only makes matters worse for women's rights. It is the only organization that can organize a worldwide campaign to force nations to stop condoning these heinous acts. The UN could impose embargoes and stop the flow of aid into nations that openly permit the abuse of women.

Like any problem, if there is not a solution, it will only get worse. It would help if there were more domestic violence and rape crisis centers in every nation in the world. These could be funded by such organizations as NOW or Amnesty International.

No matter what national governments or the United Nations do the root of the problem lies within cultures and religions. These both are tricky belief systems to change. For change to occur in either of these pillars of society takes decades or hundreds of years. Further as long as family members, friends, politicians and fellow citizens turn away their eyes and shut their ears when they know a woman lives in this type of hell, little can be done. Little can be done as long as this abuse is believed to be a private and not a public problem.

This abuse may go on privately, but the effects are enormous in public life. When a majority of women are abused at some point in their life, and this is viewed as okay, then women as a group are lowered in standing. Finally, the problem goes on in homes that a person would never imagine, and women live in fear every moment of their lives. Some wait to die and others just wait to be hit again. It's odd that in today's world with all the medicines that are being invented to cure diseases and all the organizations that are supposedly here to help save the world that domestic violence is so prevalent. Neither the UN nor national governments, nor the average person seems willing to step in and extend help to half of the human population: women. Feminists may argue women are not weak, but they are vulnerable in that no one protects them and that half of all women will be abused at some point in their life.

Bibliography

- Ali, M.M. 1992. A manual of Hadith. Lahore: Ahamadyya Anjuman Ishaat Islam.
- Apodaca, C. 1998. "Measuring women's economic and social rights achievement". *Human Rights Quarterly*, 20: 137-172.
- Barnett, O.W. and LaVoilette, A.D. 1993. *It could happen to anyone*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Basham, A.L. 1967. *The wonder that was India*. Calcutta: Rupa, Co.
- Bauschard, L. and Kimbrough, M. 1992. "Voices set free." In *Women and the law*, ed., M.J. Frug, 3: 591-601. Westbury, N.Y.: The Foundation Press.
- Broken bodies, shattered minds*. 2001. Alden Press: Oxford. Available at Amnesty International at www.amnesty.org.
- "Bureau of Justice statistics, law enforcement management and administrative statistics." 2001. xix. In *Sense and nonsense about crime and drugs*, S. Walker, 9: 180-181. Belmont, Ca.: Wadsworth Thomson Learning.
- Campbell, P.J. and Mahoney-Norris, K. 1998. "Democratization and protection of human rights." In *Unequal democracies: the gender yardstick*. 3: 31-44. Praegar Publishing Text.
- Charlesworth, H. 1994. "What are 'women's International human rights'?" In *Human rights of women: National and international perspectives* (Pennsylvania Studies in Human Rights). 3: 61-77. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Copelon, R. 1994. "Intimate terror: understanding domestic violence as torture." In *Human rights of women: National and international perspectives* (Pennsylvania Studies in Human Rights). 5: 116-145. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Downs, D.A. 1996. *More than victims: Battered women, the syndrome society and the law*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dunne, T., Wheeler, N.J. and Dunne, T. 1999. *Human rights in global politics*. Cambridge University Press. *Theories of Human Rights*(2): 18-35.
- Dutton, D.G. 1988. *The domestic assault of women: Psychological and criminal justice perspectives*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon Inc.
- Frost-Knappman, E. and Cullen-DuPont, K. 1997. *Women's rights on trial*. Detroit: New England Publishing Associates.
- Frug, M.J. 1992. *Women and the law*. Westbury, N.Y.: The Foundation Press, Inc.
- Hossain, S. "Equality in the home: women's rights and personal laws in south Asia." In *Human rights of women: National and international perspectives* (Pennsylvania Studies in Human Rights). Ed., R.J. Cook. 20: 465-486. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Hurley, J.A. 2001. *Feminism: Opposing viewpoints*. San Diego: Greenhaven Press Inc.

Julkinen, R. 2001. Virtual Finland. "Women's rights in Finland: The ascendancy of women's rights." Produced by Minister for Foreign Affairs of Finland: Available at: <http://virtual.finland.fi>

La Lettre de La fidh. April 29, 2000. Part of the Federation of International Human Rights. www.fidh.org. p. 15.

Laquer, W. and Rubin, B., ed. 1989. *The human rights reader*. Signet Publishers. International Agreements: 196-233.

MacKinnon, C.A. 1993. "Turning rape into pornography: postmodern genocide". Ms. July/August: 24-30.

Morgan, R., ed. 1984. *Sisterhood is global: The international women's movement anthology*. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Press.

Mydans, S. "Sexual violence as tool of war: Pattern emerging in East Timor." The New York Times. March 1, 2001.

Othman, N. 1999. "Grounding human rights arguments in non-western culture: Shari'a and the citizenship rights of women in a modern Islamic state". In *the East Asian challenges for human rights*. ed. J. R. Bauer and Daniel A. Bell. 7: 169- 192. Cambridge University Press.

Pleck, E. 1987. *Domestic tyranny: The making of American social policy against family violence from colonial times to the present*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Roleff, T.L., ed. 2000. *Domestic violence: Opposing viewpoints*. San Diego: Greenhaven Press, Inc..

"Report of the Gender Bias Study of the Supreme Judicial Court, Commonwealth of Massachusetts". 1992. In *Women and the law*. Westbury, N.Y.: The Foundation Press Inc,

Singh, K. 1994. "Obstacles to women's rights in India". In *Human Rights of women: National and international perspectives* (Pennsylvania Studies in Human Rights). 16: 375-393. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Spohn, C. and Horney, J. 2001. " Rape law reform". New York: Plenum, 1992. In *Sense and nonsense about crime and drugs: A policy guide*. Samuel Walker. 9: 180. Belmont, Ca.: Wadsworth, Thomas Learning, Inc.

Sherman, L. W. and Richard A. Berk. 2001. "The Minneapolis domestic violence experiment". Washington, D.C. Police Foundation, 1984. In *Sense and nonsense about crime and drugs: A policy guide*. S. Walker. 9: 180-181. Belmont, Ca.: Wadsworth, Thomas Learning, Inc.

Sherman, L. W. 2001. "Policing domestic violence: Experiment and dilemmas". New York: Free Press. 1992. In *Sense and nonsense about crime and drugs: A policy guide*. S. Walker. 9: 180-181. Belmont, Ca.: Wadsworth, Thomas Learning, Inc.

Sulkunen, I. 2001. Virtual Finland. "Finland-A pioneer in women's rights". Produced by Minister for Foreign Affairs of Finland. 22 paragraphs. Available at <http://virtual.finland.fi>

"Violence against women is a serious problem". 2000. In *Domestic violence: Opposing viewpoints*. ed., T.L. Roleff. San Diego: Greenhaven Press.

Walter, W. 1995. *Women in Islam: From medieval to modern times*. Princeton University: Markus Wiener Publishers.

Wermuth, L. 1992. "Domestic violence reforms: Policing the private". In *Women and the law*. ed., M.J. Frug. 3: 584-590. Westbury, N.Y.: The Foundation Press Inc.

West, R. 1992. "The difference in women's hedonic lives: A phenomenological critique of feminist legal theory". In *Women and the law*. ed., M.J. Frug. 3: 807-825. Westbury, N.Y.: The Foundation Press Inc.

Williams, M.E. 2000. *The Middle East: Opposing Viewpoints*. San Diego: Greenhaven Press Inc.

Footnotes

² □ Broken bodies, shattered minds 2001, 12)

³ (Broken bodies, shattered minds 2001, 2).

⁴ (Broken bodies, shattered minds 2001, 2).

⁵ Downs, D.A., More than victims: Battered women, the syndrome society and the law, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996): 57.

⁶ □ Broken bodies, shattered minds 2001, 2).

⁷ West, Robin. The Difference in Women's Hedonic Lives: A Phenomenological Critique of Feminist Legal Theory. In *Women and the Law*. Frug, M.J., ed., (Westbury, N.Y.: The Foundation Press Inc., 1992): 812.

⁸ (Broken bodies, shattered minds 2001, 3).

⁹ (Downs 1996, 64).

¹⁰ Campbell, P. J. and Mahoney-Norris, K. Democratization and Protection of Human Rights. *Unequal Democracies: the Gender Yardstick*. (Praeger Publishing Text, 1998): 32.

¹¹ □ Barnett, O.W. and LaVoilette, A.D., It could happen to anyone, (Newbury Park: Sage Publications, 1993): 37.

¹² Charlesworth, H. What are "women's International Human Rights"? In *Human Rights of Women: National and International Perspectives* (Pennsylvania Studies in Human Rights). University of Pennsylvania Press. 1994: 64.

¹³ (Charlesworth 1998, 64).

¹⁴ (Charlesworth 1998, 64).

¹⁵ (Charlesworth 1998, 60).

¹⁶ (Broken bodies, shattered minds 2001, 11).

¹⁷ (West 1992, 814).

¹⁸ Laquer, W. and Rubin, B., ed. 1989. *The Human Rights Reader*. Signet Publishers. International Agreements: 218.

¹⁹ (*The Human Rights Reader*, International Agreements: 219).

²⁰ Copelon, R., Intimate Terror: understanding domestic violence as torture., In *Human Rights of Women: National and International Perspectives* [Pennsylvania Studies in Human Rights], (University

of Pennsylvania Press, 1994): 120.

²¹ (West 1992, 824).

²² (Campbell 1998, 32).

²³ (Campbell 1998, 32).

²⁴ (Campbell 1998, 32).

²⁵ Frug, M.J., *Women and the law*, (Westbury, N.Y.: The Foundation Press, Inc, 1992): 555.

²⁶ (Charlesworth 1998, 58).

²⁷ Dunne, T., Wheeler, N.J. and Dunne, T. 1999. *Human Rights in Global Politics*. Cambridge University Press. *Theories of Human Rights*(2): 20.

²⁸ (Charlesworth 1998, 59).

²⁹ (Charlesworht 1998, 59).

³⁰ (Charlesworth 1998, 59).

³¹ (Copelon 1998, 131).

³² (Copelon 1998, 126).

³³ (Copelon 1998, 141).

³⁴ (Copelon 1998, 141).

³⁵ (Laquer and Rubin 1989, 197).

³⁶ (Laquer and Rubin 1989, 198).

³⁷ (Laquer and Rubin 1989, 198).

³⁸ (Laquer and Rubin 1989, 196).

³⁹ (Laquer and Rubin 1989, 196).

⁴⁰ MacKinnon, C.A., *Turning rape into pornography: postmodern genocide*, Ms. , (July/August 1993): 26-2.

⁴¹ (Laquer and Rubin 1989, 196).

⁴² (Charlesworth 1998, 59).

⁴³ (Charlesworth 1998, 59).

⁴⁴ (Dunne, et al. 1999, 27).

⁴⁵ (Copelon 1998, 140).

⁴⁶ (Charlesworth 1998, 60).

⁴⁷ (Charlesworth 1998, 64).

⁴⁸ (Dunne, et al. 1999, 23).

⁴⁹ (Barnett 1993, 23-24).

⁵⁰ (Barnett 1993, 33).

⁵¹ (Barnett 1993, 61).

⁵² (Barnett 1993, 31).

⁵³ (Copelon 1998, 126).

⁵⁴ (Copelon 1998, 117).

⁵⁵ (Copelon 1998, 117).

⁵⁶ (Copelon 1998, 122).

⁵⁷ (Copelon 1998, 120).

⁵⁸ (Copelon 1998, 120).

⁵⁹ (Copelon 1998, 123).

⁶⁰ (Barnett 1993, 47).

⁶¹ (Barnett 1993, 47).

- ⁶² (Copelon 1998, 122).
- ⁶³ (Copelon 1998, 123).
- ⁶⁴ (Copelon 1998, 123).
- ⁶⁵ (Copelon 1998, 122).
- ⁶⁶ (Copelon 1998, 123).
- ⁶⁷ (Copelon 1998, 123).
- ⁶⁸ (Copelon 1998, 123).
- ⁶⁹ (Copelon 1998, 123).
- ⁷⁰ (Copelon 1998, 124).
- ⁷¹ (Copelon 1998, 124).
- ⁷² (Copelon 1998, 123).
- ⁷³ (Barnett 1993, 82).
- ⁷⁴ (Barnett 1993, 82).
- ⁷⁵ (Copelon 1998, 125).
- ⁷⁶ (Barnett 1993, 56).
- ⁷⁷ (Barnett 1993, 56).
- ⁷⁸ (Barnett 1993, 88).
- ⁷⁹ (Barnett 1993, 95).
- ⁸⁰ (Barnett 1993, 95).
- ⁸¹ (Barnett 1993, 95).
- ⁸² Downs, D.A., *More than victims: Battered women, the syndrome society and the law*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996): 63.
- ⁸³ (Copelon 1998, 125).
- ⁸⁴ (Downs 1996, 63).
- ⁸⁵ (Downs 1996, 63).
- ⁸⁶ (Downs 1996, 38).
- ⁸⁷ (Downs 1996, 32).
- ⁸⁸ (Downs 1996, 32).
- ⁸⁹ (Barnett 1993, 37).
- ⁹⁰ (Barnett 1993, 37).
- ⁹¹ (West 1992, 816).
- ⁹² (Barnett 1993, 38).
- ⁹³ (Copelon 1998, 120).
- ⁹⁴ (Copelon 1998, 120).
- ⁹⁵ (Copelon 1998, 134).
- ⁹⁶ (Broken bodies, shattered minds 2001, 10).
- ⁹⁷ (Broken bodies, shattered minds 2001, 10).
- ⁹⁸ Report of the Gender Bias Study, In *Women and the law*, Frug, M.J., ed., (Westbury, N.Y.: The Foundation Press, Inc, 1992): 578.
- ⁹⁹ Violence Against Women is a serious problem, In *Domestic Violence: Opposing Viewpoints*, Roleff, T.L., (San Diego: Greenhaven Press, 2000): 46.
- ¹⁰⁰ (Violence Against Women is a serious problem 2000, 46).

- ¹⁰¹ Bauschard, L. and Kimbrough, M., *Voices Set Free*, In *Women and the Law*, Frug, M.J., ed., (Westbury, N.Y.: The Foundation Press, 1992): 591.
- ¹⁰² (Broken bodies, shattered minds 2001, 11).
- ¹⁰³ (Violence Against Women is a serious problem 2000, 46).
- ¹⁰⁴ Wermuth, L., *Domestic Violence Reforms: Policing the private*, In *Women and the law*, Frug, M.J., ed., (Westbury, N.Y.: The Foundation Press, Inc, 1992) : 585.
- ¹⁰⁵ (Wermuth 1992, 590).
- ¹⁰⁶ (Frug 1992, 578).
- ¹⁰⁷ (Frug 1992, 578).
- ¹⁰⁸ (Frug 1992, 578).
- ¹⁰⁹ (Frug 1992, 578).
- ¹¹⁰ (Wermuth 1992, 590).
- ¹¹¹ Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics*, 1997, xix, In *Sense and Nonsense about Crime and Drugs*, Walker, S. (Belmont, Ca.: Wadsworth Thomson Learning, 2001): 181.
- ¹¹² Sherman, L.W. *Policing Domestic Violence* (New York: Free Press, 1992), In *Sense and Nonsense about Crime and Drugs*, Walker, S. (Belmont, Ca.: Wadsworth Thomson Learning, 2001): 181.
- ¹¹³ (Spohn and Horney 2001, 180).
- ¹¹⁴ (Spohn and Horney 2001, 180).
- ¹¹⁵ (Spohn and Horney 2001, 180).
- ¹¹⁶ Sulkunen, I. 2001. *Virtual Finland: Finland-A Pioneer in Women's Rights*. Produced by Minister for Foreign Affairs of Finland. Available at: <http://virtual.finland.fi.>, 22 paragraphs: par. 9.
- ¹¹⁷ (Sulkunen 2001, par. 9).
- ¹¹⁸ Julkinen, R. 2001. *Virtual Finland: Women's Rights in Finland: The ascendancy of women's rights*. Produced by Minister for Foreign Affairs of Finland: Available at: <http://virtual.finland.fi.>: par. 4.
- ¹¹⁹ (Julkinen 2001, par. 4).
- ¹²⁰ (Julkinen 2001, par. 4).
- ¹²¹ La Lettre de La fidh. Part of the Federation of International Human Rights. Available at: www.fidh.org, April 29, 2000, p. 15.
- ¹²² (La lettre 2000, 15).
- ¹²³ (La lettre 2000, 15).
- ¹²⁴ (La lettre 2000, 15).
- ¹²⁵ (La lettre 2000, 15).
- ¹²⁶ (La lettre 2000, 15).
- ¹²⁷ (La lettre 2000, 15).

- ¹²⁸ (Broken bodies, shattered minds 2001, 12).
- ¹²⁹ Singh, K. Obstacles to women's rights in India. In *Human Rights of Women: National and International Perspectives* [Pennsylvania Studies in Human Rights], (University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994): 377.
- ¹³⁰ (Singh 1998, 377).
- ¹³¹ (Broken bodies, shattered minds 2001, 11).
- ¹³² (Singh 1998, 389).
- ¹³³ (Singh 1998, 389).
- ¹³⁴ (Singh 1998, 389).
- ¹³⁵ (Singh 1998, 389).
- ¹³⁶ (Singh 1998, 389).
- ¹³⁷ (Singh 1998, 389).
- ¹³⁸ (Broken bodies, shattered minds 2001, 28).
- ¹³⁹ (Broken bodies, shattered minds 2001, 28).
- ¹⁴⁰ Ali, M.M., *A manual of Hadith*, Lahore: Ahamadyya Anjuman Ishaat Islam, 1992): 53.
- ¹⁴¹ Othman, N., Grounding Human Rights Arguments in non-western culture: Shari'a and the citizenship rights of Women in a Modern Islamic State, In *the East Asian Challenges for Human Rights*, Bauer, J.R. and Bell, D.A., ed., (Cambridge University Press, 1999): 172.
- ¹⁴² (Othman 1998, 172).
- ¹⁴³ (Othman 1998, 173).
- ¹⁴⁴ (Othman 1998, 174).
- ¹⁴⁵ (Othman 1998, 175).
- ¹⁴⁶ (Broken bodies, shattered minds 2001, 15).
- ¹⁴⁷ (Broken bodies, shattered minds 2001, 15).
- ¹⁴⁸ (Othman 1998, 181).
- ¹⁴⁹ (Othman 1998, 186).
- ¹⁵⁰ (Othman 1998 186,).
- ¹⁵¹ (Othman 1998, 186).
- ¹⁵² (Othman 1998, 187).
- ¹⁵³ Mydens, S., *Sexual Violence as Tool of War: Pattern emerging in East Timor*, *The New York Times*: March 1, 2001: par. 14.
- ¹⁵⁴ (Mydens 2001, par. 15).
- ¹⁵⁵ (Mydens 2001, par. 7).
- ¹⁵⁶ (Mydens 2001, par. 5).
- ¹⁵⁷ (Mydens 2001, par. 9).
- ¹⁵⁸ (MacKinnon 1993, 25).
- ¹⁵⁹ (MacKinnon 1993, 25).
- ¹⁶⁰ (MacKinnon 1993, 26).
- ¹⁶¹ (MacKinnon 1993, 26).
- ¹⁶² (MacKinnon 1993, 26).
- ¹⁶³ (MacKinnon 1993, 26).

¹⁶⁴ (Broken bodies, shattered minds 2001, 24,).

¹⁶⁵ (Human Rights 1997).

¹⁶⁶ (Broken bodies, shattered minds 2001, 24).

¹⁶⁷ (Broken bodies, shattered minds 2001, 24).

¹⁶⁸ (Broken bodies, shattered minds 2001, 23).

¹⁶⁹ (Broken bodies, shattered minds 2001, 23).

¹⁷⁰ (Broken bodies, shattered minds 2001, 10).

¹⁷¹ (Broken bodies, shattered minds 2001, 25).

¹⁷² (Broken bodies, shattered minds 2001, 3).

¹⁷³ (Broken bodies, shattered minds 2001, 29).

**Dover Memorial Library
Gardner-Webb University
P.O. Box 836
Boiling Springs, N.C. 28017**

Gardner-Webb University Library



0 0000 00205143 3